



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Hope add 322

P. R.

THE
THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY;

CONSISTING OF
ORIGINAL ESSAYS, HINTS,
QUERIES, &c.

THE
THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY;

CONSISTING OF
ORIGINAL ESSAYS, HINTS,
QUERIES, &c.

CALCULATED TO PROMOTE
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

V O L. VI.

Παύλα δαμασέε.

PAUL.

*— Si quid novisti rectius istis,
Candidus imperti. —*

HORACE.

BIRMINGHAM,
PRINTED BY PEARSON AND ROLLASON, FOR J. JOHNSON,
NO. 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON.

MDCCLXXXVIII.

T H E
C O N T E N T S
O F T H E
S I X T H V O L U M E.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Of the Perpetuity of the Jewish Ritual</i> (continued from Vol. V. p. 444.) HER- MAS. | I |
| <i>On the Observance of the Lord's Day.</i> PHI- LANDER. | 22—113 |
| <i>Observations on the Divine Mission of Moses</i> (continued from Vol. V. p. 384.) MOSAI- CUS. | 39 |
| <i>On the Connexion between Faith in the Divine Mission of Christ, and that of Moses and the Prophets.</i> A CHRISTIAN. | 49 |
| <i>On the Oblation of Isaac, as figurative of the Death of Christ.</i> EREUNETES. | 60 |
| <i>A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv. with Notes, critical and explanatory.</i> NEPIODIDA SCA LOS. | 74 |
| <i>Of Love to Christ on Unitarian Principles,</i> X. Y. Z. | 99 |
| <i>An Attempt to shew, that the Cock-crowing which Peter heard was the Sound of a Trumpet.</i> ANGLO SCOTUS. | 105 On |

| | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|
| <i>On the Elijah foretold by Malachi.</i> | IDIOTA. | 135 |
| <i>Observations on some Articles in the preceding Parts of this Work.</i> | ANGLO-SCOTUS. | 175 |
| <i>An Attempt to ascertain the Meaning of $\mu\eta$ Βατοδωριστῆς, use not vain Repetitions, in Matt. vi. 7.</i> | Ditto | 178 |
| <i>An Attempt to illustrate the xxivth Chapter of Matthew's Gospel.</i> | Ditto. | 186 |
| <i>An Attempt to illustrate the first ten Verses of the third Chapter of Jobn's Gospel.</i> | Ditto. | 194 |
| <i>Difficulties in the Interpretation of some Prophecies not yet fulfilled, and Queries relating to them.</i> | PAMPHILUS. | 203 |
| <i>Strictures on the Observations of Pamphilus, relating to the Inspiration of Christ.</i> | JODVADIB. | 208 |
| <i>Of the Prince Michael.</i> | PHILALETHES. | 216 |
| <i>An Account of the Rev. John Palmer, and of some Articles intended by him for this Repository.</i> | J. PRIESTLEY | 217 |
| <i>Remarks upon some Observations in Dr. Price's Sermons, relating to the Person and Character of Jesus Christ.</i> | DAVIDES. | 225—349 |
| <i>An Enquiry into the Time, at which the Kingdom of Heaven will commence.</i> | IDIOTA. | 244 |
| <i>An Essay on the Grounds of Love to Christ.</i> | PHILOSOTER. | 284 |
| <i>Observations on Christ's Agony in the Garden.</i> | PAMPHILUS. | 302—347 |
| <i>Objections to Ordination among Dissenters.</i> | A LOVER OF ORDER. | 322 |
| <i>The Observance of the Lord's Day vindicated.</i> | SUBSIDIARIUS. | 331 |
| | | <i>A new</i> |

C O N T E N T S, vii

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>A new Interpretation of Isaiah, ix. &c.</i> PHILALETHES. | 344 |
| <i>Objections to a weekly Day of Rest.</i> EUBULUS. | 352 |
| <i>Of the Discourse with Nicodemus and the Woman of Samaria.</i> AUXILIATOR. | 372 |
| <i>A Query concerning the Origin of the low Arian Doctrine.</i> JOSEPHUS. | 376 |
| <i>The Scripture Doctrine of the Love of Christ.</i> ADJUTOR. | 382 |
| <i>Queries relating to the Religion of Indostan.</i> SCRUTATOR. | 408 |
| <i>A new Interpretation of John vi.</i> PHILALETHES. | 415 |
| <i>A new Interpretation of John iv.</i> Ditto. | 419 |
| <i>John i. 51.</i> Ditto. | 424 |
| <i>A Postscript to the Illustration of John iii. &c.</i> PHILALETHES. | 425 |
| <i>An Illustration of 2 Cor. v. 1, &c.</i> MARMOS. | 428 |
| <i>The Observance of the Lord's Day vindicated.</i> HERMAS. | 465 |
| <i>Of the Origin of the Arian Hypothesis.</i> JOSEPHUS. | 484 |

TEXTS

T E X T S

O. F

S C R I P T U R E,

ILLUSTRATED IN THE SIXTH VOLUME.

| | Page | | Page |
|-------------------------|---------|----------------------|------|
| I SA. ix. 6, &c. | 345 | Rom x. 4 | 5 |
| Mal. iv. 6 | 136—143 | 1 Cor. ix. 18 | 7 |
| Matt. vi. 7 | — 178 | — xv. | 79 |
| — xi. 14 | — 136 | 2 Cor. iii. 11 | 4 |
| — xxiv. | — 186 | Gal. iii. 23. | 3 |
| — xxvi. 34 | — 105 | Coll. i. 20. iii. 11 | 9 |
| John iii. 1—11 | 194—372 | Eph. v. 11. | 8 |
| — 12, &c. | — 420 | Heb. ix. 10 | 14 |
| — iv. 14, &c. | 419 | — x. 1. | ib. |
| — vi. 33, &c. | 415 | 1 John iii. 5 | 243 |
| Rom. vi. 2—12 | — 349 | | |

OF THE

Perpetuity of the JEWISH RITUAL.

[Continued from Vol. V. page 444.]

SECTION VI.

Of what may be inferred from the writings of the Apostle Paul concerning the abolition of the laws of Moses.

I NOW proceed to the particular consideration of the writings of the apostle Paul; but before I examine any passages in them, I would make two general observations.

1. We should not, *a priori*, expect to find any doctrines of peculiar magnitude, such as this concerning the abrogation of the laws of Moses, in the epistles of this apostle, when there was no mention of any such thing in the book of Acts, or any other books of the New Testament. The alarm which a thing of this nature must have given to the Jewish converts, who were *zealous for the law*, would have been so great, that there must have been perpetual occasion to speak of it, in order to answer the objections of the unbelieving Jews, and to reconcile the minds of the believing ones to it. But (excepting the case of Paul) we

Vol. VI. B per-

perceive no trace of any alarm being given, or of any objections being made, or answered, in the book of Acts, or any of the epistles of Peter, James, Jude, or John, most of which appear to have been written for the particular use of the Jewish converts.

2. It is never asserted in clear and express terms by Paul himself, that any of the laws of Moses were abrogated. Indeed this would have been in direct contradiction to his saying that the law was not *made void*, but *established* by the gospel. His object in all that he says on this subject was evidently to prevent the Gentile converts from being drawn into the observance of circumcision, and other rites of the Jewish religion. We should not, therefore, suppose that he meant any thing more than this, unless he was particular in saying that he *did* mean more; and if he had meant any thing more, he had frequent occasions for declaring it. Would it not, for instance, have been exceedingly natural for him, when treating so largely, and so frequently on this subject, to say that “not only are the Gentiles under no obligation to observe the laws of Moses, but the Jews themselves are no longer bound by them. We are all at liberty to discontinue the former observances, in consequence of the law being fulfilled in the gospel.” But it is in vain that we look for any sentiment, or expression of this kind in all the apostle’s writings.

The object of the apostle in his epistle to the Galatians, was to dissuade them who were Gentiles from conforming to the Jewish ritual; and, in the course of his argument on this subject, he advances

vances many things unfavourable to the Jewish religion, when compared with the gospel; but still he gives no intimation that the former was abolished *with respect to the Jews*, who had been formerly bound by it. I shall, however, recite those passages in this epistle which are most liable to bear such a construction.

Gal. iii. 23, &c. 'But before faith came we
' were kept under the law, shut up unto the
' faith which should afterwards be revealed:
' Wherefore the law was our school-master, to
' bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified
' by faith. But after that faith is come, we are
' no longer under a school-master; for ye are all
' the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. For
' as many of you as have been baptized into Christ
' have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor
' Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is nei-
' ther male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ
' Jesus; and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abra-
' ham's seed, and heirs, according to the promise.'

The meaning of the apostle in this passage is, that the law of Moses respecting the Jews was preparatory to the religion of Christ, which respects the whole world of Jews and Gentiles. In the 25th verse he is speaking in the character not of the Jews, but of the Gentiles, who were obliged before the promulgation of the gospel, to learn the principles of true religion from the Jews, who alone had been favoured with divine revelation; but now had a teacher whose instructions were directed immediately to themselves, without any farther interposition of the Jews.

That he did not mean by what he says in the 28th verse, that the distinction between the Jews and the Greeks was to cease, but only that they should consider each other as brethren, or *one body in Christ*, is evident from his making this a parrallel case with the distinctions of bond and free, male and female, which certainly did not cease in consequence of the gospel. In like manner he says, chap. v. 6. 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love;' that is, both Jews and Gentiles are equally *christians*, and ought to love one another as such, and not that the Jews were to cease to be Jews, discontinuing all their peculiar observances.

Chap. iv. 9. Paul calls the institutions of Moses *weak and beggarly elements*, but this was in comparison with the gospel, and respected the Gentiles; on whom they were not obligatory.

I shall now proceed to note what Paul has said on this subject in his other epistles, taking them in the order of time in which they were probably written.

A passage most favourable to the supposition of the total abolishing of the Mosaic law, occurs in the second epistle to the Corinthians, in which he says, ch. iii. 11. 'If that which is done away was glorious, much more then what remaineth is glorious.' In this he alludes to the temporary glory, or resplendency, on the face of Moses when he descended from the Mount, after conversing with God, *which glory*, he says, v. 7. *was to be done away*. He also presently after speaks of the whole Mosaic system as to be abolished, v. 13.

‘ And not as Moses, who put a vail over his face,
‘ that the children of Israel could not stedfastly
‘ look to the end of that which is abolished.’

But I cannot help thinking, that by *abolished*, in this place, the apostle did not mean what the term naturally and strictly denotes; but only meant to represent the law as greatly inferior to the gospel, the glory of which does not vanish, as did the glory on the face of Moses. Or rather, as he was writing to a Gentile church, whom he was endeavouring to divert from their propensity to judaize, he means to speak of the Mosaical observances as of no obligation *to them*, but the same as if they had been abrogated. This, it is acknowledged, supposes the apostle not to have been very attentive to the strict meaning of the language he used; but it appears to me to be the best method of reconciling one part of scripture to another, and even this very apostle to himself.

In the epistle to the Romans, ch. vii. 1, &c. the apostle introduces an allegorical representation, in which he supposes that there is a *principle of sin* in man, by which he is liable to the punishment of law in general, and that of Moses in particular, which *principle*, or *body of sin*, being dead by the power of the gospel, our subjection to that law ceases. But this is no otherwise true of the law of Moses, than it is of *law in general*, and the illustration which follows relates to moral duties only.

Ch. x. 4. Paul says, that *Christ is the end of the law of righteousness*. But this can only mean that the gospel method of justification is superior to that of the law, which was subservient to it; which in other places he asserts more

largely. It does not imply that the one superseded the other.

In the 14th chapter of this epistle, the apostle gives directions about the observance of the Jewish distinction of days and meats, which he plainly thought it right that the Gentiles should disregard. Those who could do this he calls *strong* in the faith, and expects them to bear with their weaker brethren, who, being instructed by Jewish converts, had scruples on the subject, and who ought not to do what they really thought to be wrong. He says, v. 14. 'I am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.' But this is to be understood in the same sense with what our Lord himself had said on the subject, an account of which was given before. It is certain that abstaining from certain kinds of food had nothing to do with *moral virtue*, but this consideration did not prevent the divine Being from insisting upon injunctions of that kind with respect to the Jews; and those might, for the same reasons, be continued under the gospel. That, in this epistle, the apostle is addressing the Gentiles, and not the Jews, is evident from ch. i. 13. 'Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that often-times I purposed to come unto you—that I might have some fruit among you, even as among other Gentiles.'

There were, no doubt, Jewish converts at Rome, as well as Gentile ones; but in general it was a Gentile church, as much as that at Corinth, and therefore it is most natural to suppose that the advices he gave respected the Gentiles. Had he
really

really meant to shew the insignificance of the Mosaic observances *with respect to the Jews*, he would certainly have addressed them in a very different manner. He could never expect that prejudices, if they were such, so rooted as those of the Jews in favour of their own law, would be so easily removed.

Paul has been thought to make light of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles in what he says, 1 Cor. ix. 18, &c. 'What is my reward then? Verily, that when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel. For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. To them that are without law, as without law, that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men, that I might, by all means, save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake; that I might be partaker thereof with you.'

This rhetorical language is not to be construed with too much rigour. For then we shall make the apostle to have been a most inconsistent and hypocritical character, who would not scruple to do any thing to gain his ends; whereas he, with great indignation, disclaims the maxim of *doing evil that good may come*. The object that he had in view was to describe his own patience, forbearance, and condescension, in order to promote the gospel;

treating the innocent prejudices of all persons with the greatest tenderness. What *specific things* he would have done with this general view, we cannot infer from such language as this.

In the second chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians there is a passage, which, literally interpreted, might lead us to think that the apostle considered the Jewish law as wholly abolished. It is as follows, v. 11, &c. ' Wherefore remember, that ye being
 ' in time passed Gentiles in the flesh, who are called
 ' uncircumcision, by that which is called the cir-
 ' cumcision in the flesh made by hands, that at that
 ' time ye were without Christ, being aliens from
 ' the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from
 ' the covenants of promise, having no hope, and
 ' without God in the world. But now in Christ
 ' Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off, are made
 ' nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace,
 ' who hath made both one, and hath broken down
 ' the middle wall of partition between us (having
 ' abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of
 ' commandments, contained in ordinances, for to
 ' make in himself of twain one new man so mak-
 ' ing peace, and that he might reconcile both unto
 ' God in one body by the cross, having slain the
 ' enmity thereby) and came and preached peace to
 ' you who were afar off, and to them that were nigh.
 ' For through him we have both access by one
 ' spirit unto the Father.'

On this I would observe, that the design of the apostle in this part of his epistle, is to represent the privileges of the Gentiles, in being brought into the church and family of God equally with the Jews; and for this purpose he speaks of the Jewish ritual

ritual as being no hindrance to that great object. The *abolition* therefore that he speaks of should not be interpreted to mean more than is necessary to that end; and for this purpose it was not requisite that the law of Moses should be abolished *with respect to the Jews*, but only that the Jews should not consider it as extending to the Gentiles; because that was sufficient to their considering them as brethren and fellow christians, though they did not conform to their peculiar rites.

The same idea this apostle expresses in the sister epistle, as it is often called, to the Colossians, in which he speaks of Christ as having *reconciled all things to himself*, ch. i. 20. so that he says, ch. iii. 11. 'There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all.'—That is, though the distinctions here mentioned remain, they are to be considered as nothing, compared with the union of them all under one head, Jesus Christ. Though therefore, in this epistle, as in that to the Ephesians, he speaks, ch. ii. 14. of Christ 'blotting out the hand writing of ordinances, that was against us, that was contrary to us, and taking it out of the way, nailing it to his cross,' he does not mean that the laws of Moses were not binding upon the Jews, concerning whose obligation it was not his object, in this epistle, to say any thing at all, but that it was not to be imposed upon the Gentiles.

It may seem harsh to speak of that being *abolished* and *blotted out*, which, with respect to the Gentiles, never existed at all; but considering the figurative style of the apostle, he might be led to use

use this language, from the stress that had been laid by the Jews upon the peculiar rites of their religion, and their holding them to be obligatory on the Gentile converts; in consequence of which many had been induced to comply with them.—All this, which had taken place, had been wrong, and the apostle thought himself authorised to say, that it was abolished by christianity.

I am ready, however, to acknowledge, that had it appeared by any circumstances in the conduct of this apostle, or any clear and express declarations on the subject, that he thought himself, and other Jewish christians, to be actually free from any obligation to the laws of Moses, and that he had encouraged any native Jews to disuse circumcision, sacrifices, or any other part of their ritual, the natural interpretation of his language in these particular passages would have been, that he considered all the laws of Moses as actually abrogated. But this not being the case, but the direct contrary, the circumstances in which he wrote, and his manifest object in writing, will sufficiently authorise us to suppose that his language is not to be construed so literally. If this had been his meaning, it must have appeared by other circumstances than these particular expressions.

Many examples may be produced from other writers, not remarkably inaccurate, of words not being used in their strict sense, which should caution us not to build much upon single expressions. Thus the marriage service of the church of England, if interpreted literally, would imply that every man who enters into that state had been connected with several women, because he is there required

quired to *forsake all others*, and to keep to one. But certainly he who composed that service had no such idea, and if he had attended to his language, would have expressed himself differently. And why should we suppose the apostle to have been more attentive to his language than other writers?

There are several passages in the epistle to the Hebrews, as liable to be misunderstood as those above-quoted from the epistles to the Ephesians and Collossians. But here also we should consider the figurative style of the writer, and his particular view in the passages in question.

Thus, ch. x. 1. he calls the law a *shadow of good things to come*. But by this language he only meant to represent the law as an institution preparatory to the gospel, and not as to be set aside by it; as in a variety of places in which he speaks of sacrifices and the priesthood, he represents the Jewish religion as inferior to the christian, but he never intimates that it was superseded by it.

In the seventh chapter of this epistle the writer argues in favour of the superiority of the priesthood of Christ to that of Aaron, because he was to be a priest after the order of Melchizedec, v. 11. ‘ If therefore, perfection were by
‘ the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law) what farther need was
‘ there that another priest should arise after the
‘ order of Melchizedec, and not be called after
‘ the order of Aaron. For the priesthood being
‘ changed, there is made of necessity a change
‘ also of the law.’ Afterwards he adds, v. 18.
‘ There

‘ There was therefore a difannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.’

I shall make no remark here on the extreme weakness of the *argument*, and as to the *language* he makes use of, I am disposed to consider it in the same light with his use of the term *abolition*, in the epistle to the Corinthians mentioned above. I cannot persuade myself, for the reasons there given, that he meant to be understood in the strict sense of his words, but intended to intimate that though the Jewish priesthood was to continue, Christ was also a priest, and of a higher order than any descendant of Aaron. The *change* he speaks of was not the substitution of one thing in the place of another, but the addition of a similar thing of greater value.

In the eighth chapter of this epistle, the writer quotes that passage in Jeremiah, of which an account has been given above, and he descants upon it in the following manner, ch. viii. 5. &c.

‘ Which serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle. For see, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant
‘ nant

‘nant with the house of Israel, and with the
 ‘house of Judah; not according to the cove-
 ‘nant which I made with their fathers, in the
 ‘day when I took them by the hand to lead them
 ‘out of the land of Egypt, because they conti-
 ‘nued not in my covenant, and I regarded them
 ‘not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant
 ‘that I will make with the house of Israel after
 ‘those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws
 ‘into their mind, and write them in their hearts,
 ‘and I will be to them a God and they shall be
 ‘to me a people. And they shall not teach
 ‘every man his neighbour, and every man his
 ‘brother, saying, know the Lord; for all shall
 ‘know me, from the least to the greatest. For I
 ‘will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and
 ‘their sins and their iniquities will I remember
 ‘no more. In that he saith, a new covenant, he
 ‘hath made the first old. Now that which decay-
 ‘eth, and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.’

In order to understand this, we must recollect
 that the *covenant* of which Jeremiah spake was a
 mere *promise* from God, to confer certain blessings
 upon the Israelites, which promise he had not been
 able to fulfil on account of their sins, but that then,
in the latter days, he would make a new covenant,
 or a new engagement, to bless them; and this he
 would be able to carry into effect, because they
 would not be disobedient to him any more. The
 covenant, therefore, that was *old*, and *ready to*
vanish away, was not what we may call the *Old*
Testament, or the law of Moses, but the original
 promise of God to Abraham, which had not been
 completely fulfilled on account of obstacles on the
 part

part of those to whom it had been made. The maxim of God's conduct in this respect had been fully explained by Ezekiel, who, in the name of God, declares that no promises, or threatnings, were properly *absolute*; but, however they might be expressed, were in reality *conditional*; the performance of the thing promised or threatened still depending upon the conduct of those to whom the promise, or the threatening, had been made.

When this writer speaks of the Jewish ritual, Heb. ix. 10. as *imposed until the time of reformation*, we are only to understand that this was to be the only dispensation of revealed religion till the coming of Christ, who came not to abolish the law of Moses, but to make a more extensive revelation of the will of God, for the benefit of the whole world of mankind, independent of that law which was only adapted to the condition of a single nation; by the observance of which, in conjunction with christianity, they were to be distinguished to the end of time; the principles of the two religions having nothing in them repugnant to each other.

The same rule of interpretation we must observe with respect to Heb. xvi. 1, &c. in which the writer shews that the sacrifices under the law could not cleanse the conscience from moral impurity, in which argument he quotes Ps. xl. 6.

Heb. x. 1, &c. ' For the law having a
' shadow of good things to come, and not the
' very image of the things, can never, with those
' sacrifices which they offered year by year con-
' tinually, make the comers thereunto per-
' fect. For then would they not have ceased to
' be offered, because that the worshippers, once
' purged,

‘ purged, should have had no more conscience of
 ‘ sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remem-
 ‘ brance again made of sins every year. For it is
 ‘ not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats
 ‘ should take away sins. Wherefore, when he
 ‘ cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and
 ‘ offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast
 ‘ then prepared me. In burnt offerings and sacri-
 ‘ fices for sin thou hast no pleasure. Then said I,
 ‘ lo I come (in the volume of the book it is written
 ‘ of me) to do thy will, O God. Above when he
 ‘ said, sacrifice, and offering, and burnt offerings,
 ‘ and offerings for sin, thou wouldest not, neither
 ‘ hadst pleasure therein (which are offered by the
 ‘ law) then said he, Lo I come to do thy will,
 ‘ O God. He taketh away the first, that he may
 ‘ establish the second. By the which will we are
 ‘ sanctified, through the offering of the body of
 ‘ Jesus Christ once for all.’

Nothing can be more evident than that the meaning of the Psalmist was, not that the sacrifices under the law would be refused by God, but that repentance and reformation were duties of superior obligation. The writer of this epistle therefore could not be authorized to infer any thing else from it. And by the phrases *taking away the first*, and *establishing the second*, he probably meant nothing more than that the latter were of more value than the former.

It is remarkable that, notwithstanding the pains the writer of this epistle takes to represent the gospel dispensation as superior to the Jewish, he never asserts in express terms, that the Jews *ought* to, or *might*, discontinue their sacrifices, or neglect any
 part

part of their ritual, which he could not have avoided doing, if such had been his real opinion. And at the time of writing this epistle, the Jewish war was very near breaking out, and consequently the Jewish polity near its termination; so that there could have been no impropriety in the apostle teaching openly what it is thought that catastrophe was intended to teach. Events may be easily misinterpreted, and all persons might not be disposed to draw the same conclusions from them. If, therefore, this was the meaning of Providence, it might have been expected that it would have been distinctly announced, at least so near to the event, and in such a writing as this.

SECTION VII.

General observations on the subject.

Many christians, I am well aware, have conceived so great a dislike to the business of *sacrificing*, and other parts of the Jewish ritual, that they cannot reconcile themselves to the idea of the restoration of them. But to this it is not necessary to give any answer at all. Sacrifices have certainly been of divine appointment, and only he that imposed the obligation can take it off. The most polished nations in the world worshipped their several deities by means of sacrifices, and without ever intimating so much as a suspicion that there was any thing in them at which their minds revolted. Offerings of the several articles of our sustenance, vegetable and animal, seem to be a natural method of expressing the sense we have of our

our having received them all from God, and acknowledging our obligations to him. In eastern countries it is still thought improper to approach a prince without a present; and in this the value of the thing is not so much considered, as its being a token of homage and respect.

It is often said, that the mode of worshipping by sacrifices was only introductory to something more spiritual, and better suited the infantine state of the world, and is therefore useless when the more perfect and manly method is established. But this idea by no means corresponds to the fact, We see in the book of Psalms, and in other parts of the Old Testament (to say nothing of the prayers of our Saviour and of the apostles in the New) instances of as correct and sublime devotion as the mind of man is capable of; and yet it did not supersede the business of sacrificing. Sentiments of the greatest reverence for the perfections and government of God, as an almighty, allwise, and perfectly good being, every where present, and standing in no need of the services of any of his creatures, and also of an unbounded confidence in his righteous administration, and providential care, are intermixed with vows of offerings and whole burnt offerings, which are every where represented as infinitely inferior in real value to acts of moral virtue, without the least intimation of there being any thing heterogeneous or discordant in them. And though the rational part of the christian world have hitherto confined themselves to what they call a more spiritual worship, they may soon see the propriety of reverting to the an-

cient mode of expressing their homage in conjunction with it.

Circumcision is a rite much more open to objection than the business of sacrificing, and yet there can be no doubt of its having been of divine appointment; and if it was to be continued for the space of two thousand years, why may it not be intended to be continued, as it is expressly said to be, to the end of time. But in all these cases, what we have to do is to satisfy ourselves with respect to the *divine appointment*, and if that be clear, to acquiesce in it.

They who think that the sacrifices under the law were only appointed as *types* of the great sacrifice of Jesus Christ, may think that when the anti-type is come, the type is unnecessary; though I do not see why it may not be as useful, to remind us of the anti-type, *after* it has taken place, as it was to make us look towards it *before* it took place. But even then, persons must, I think, find some difficulty in the consideration of the conformity of the apostles, and the Jewish christians in general, to the temple service, after the death of Christ, and till the destruction of the temple. If this was done to comply with the prejudices of the Jews, that consideration will have the same weight whenever they are converted to christianity. For their attachment to the rites of their religion is not lessened by their calamities and dispersion, and they are no more disposed to abandon the law for the sake of the gospel *now*, than they were in any former period.

It

It is remarkable, that every argument of much plausibility in favour of the perpetual abrogation of the Mosaic law, is derived from the epistles of Paul; and as he was in an especial manner the apostle of the Gentiles, it might be presumed that he was better informed on this subject than the other apostles. But he no where *says* that he had received more light than they had, in this, or in any other respect. "In conference," he says, Gal. ii. 6. "they added nothing to him." But neither does it appear that he added any thing to them. However, no man's opinion is to be regarded any farther than it is supported either by reason, or divine authority. All the reasoning of Paul on this subject is calculated to prove that the law of Moses is not obligatory on the Gentiles; and in order to prove this point, he never says in plain terms, that it was not obligatory on the Jews, so far is he from pretending to divine authority for the complete abrogation of that law. It must be acknowledged, however, that in his writings on this subject he often expresses himself in so unguarded and exceptionable a manner, that we cannot wonder that they gave so much offence to the more zealous Jewish christians.

Some think that the mention that is made of a temple, and of sacrifices, in the prophecies of Ezekiel, only prove that the Jews will return to their own country before their conversion to christianity; so that, though they will at first restore the temple service, they will discontinue it when they become christians. But I think it is impossible to give due attention to those most remarkable

prophecies, without being impressed with an idea that they contain a description of the final state of the Jews, such as it is to continue to the end of time; and therefore, whether they be converted before, or after their return (which is a question of some difficulty) we must conclude, that the service of the temple will be resumed, and be perpetual; and that the Gentiles will join in some parts of it, though they will not be circumcised, or conform to the whole law, as Jews.

It may be asked, what advantage will the Jews derive from the observance of their burthensome ritual; since the favour of God, with respect to a future world, will not be confined to them, or be conferred on them on account of those observances. I answer, that they will have all the advantages which were promised to the descendants of Abraham, which consist of blessings of a temporal nature only, in the pre-eminence of their nation, and the undisturbed possession of a valuable part of the globe. At the same time, any Jew who shall not think proper to lay in his claim to his share of this honour will be at liberty so to do, without incurring the divine displeasure, provided he be a good man in other respects. But I should think, that if any person could really prove his descent from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, he would be not a little proud of it, and would not be willing to relinquish it on account of any of the services annexed to the character.

Though I contend for the resumption of the Mosaic ritual in general, I am far from denying that favourable alterations may be made in it by divine

divine authority, to be declared in due time, so as to adapt it to the future and final state of the world ; as some of the observances seem to have been intended to counteract the influence of some kinds of ancient idolatry, which now no longer exist. But no alteration which has this for its object, can be supposed to affect the mode of worshipping by sacrifices, the rite of circumcision, and many other institutions, which do not relate to temporary circumstances, but by the observance of which the Jews may be honourably distinguished from other nations to the end of time.

Having now advanced all that has occurred to me on this subject, I wait the remarks of your learned readers, and am,

Gentlemen,

Yours, &c.

HERMAS.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

THE following paper, occasioned by that of Eubulus, will, I doubt not, be allowed a place in your useful work, if it be judged worthy of one. Some other correspondent of yours will, I trust, feel himself prompted to take up after me the defence of the practice objected to by that gentleman. If he be in the wrong, and any other reader of the Repository be convinced with me that he is so, he will surely not be backward to lend all the additional support he can afford to that side of the question which I have espoused. The subject to be discussed must, in the view of such a person, be one of very high importance. I, therefore, flatter myself with the prospect of assistance. Under this expectation, I feel less reluctance to lay my humble attempt before the public, presuming that I shall see any omissions or defects, which may be discovered in what I have written, amply supplied by some abler pen.

1. The Jewish sabbath was plainly intended to be not merely a day of rest from bodily labour, but also of public and social religious worship. It was to be celebrated by a *holy convocation*, which, no doubt, signified the calling of the people together to join in acts of public worship to their
1 Maker.

Maker. On that day *they were not to do their own ways, nor find their own pleasure, nor speak their own words*, i. e. as it should seem, they were not to pursue their secular employments, to indulge themselves in taking recreations and diversions, or to talk about matters of worldly business. In other words, they were to spend the day in nothing but religious meditation and devotional exercises.— This I apprehend to have been sufficiently proved by Dr. Jennings (See his *Jewish Ant.* B. 3. C. 3.) and others. Accordingly we find, that the prophets severely reprehended the Jews for either the violation, or neglect of the sabbath. Now, if God thought fit to appoint one day in seven to be thus kept by a particular people, to threaten those who disobeyed his command with excision, to remind them from time to time by his prophets of the obligation they were under to observe that day in the manner they prescribed, and to advertise them of the dreadful consequences, national as well as personal, which would follow inattention to this duty, there is the highest reason to suppose that the wisdom of the Deity saw it to be necessary, for the spiritual improvement of his people, that they should devote one day of the week to religious exercises, without interruption from temporal concerns. If this be admitted, and that human nature remains the same, and liable to the same influences from present scenes and occupations, it is no more than a fair presumption, that God intended that mankind should allot the proportion of one seventh part of their time to religious employments under *all* his dispensations.

2. The christian dispensation arose, as it were, out of the Jewish. It derived part of its evidence from the accomplishment of predictions delivered by Jewish prophets. It was introduced by a person educated a Jew, and sent himself to none but the people of his own nation. Any practice, therefore, which this person did not expressly abrogate, but himself conform to, after he was invested with his public character, he was, no doubt, regarded as acknowledging to be still obligatory upon his countrymen. The Jewish sabbath he appears himself to have kept, and not to have objected to its being kept by the Jews, according to the direction of their law. It is true, that he condemned the Jews of weak and groundless superstition in pretending that acts of beneficence were not to be performed on that day; but he no where charged any of them with a fault, after they became his disciples, in continuing to attend the worship of the temple or synagogue, or in employing the part of it, spent at their homes, in a religious manner. As we are not informed that he did any thing of this sort, the countenance, which he gave to the observance of the sabbath by his own behaviour, stood unopposed. And though the particular reason, for which the keeping of the seventh day was prescribed to the Jews, does not affect others, so that from that circumstance it cannot be inferred, that gentile converts were bound to keep the same, yet the conduct of our Lord in employing the seventh part of his time according to the established custom of his country, and in not giving the most distant hint, that it was too much to be so employed, shews

shews that he did not think it a too large proportion of time to be devoted to religious purposes.

Had this really been his opinion, and had he, therefore, intended to shorten it for the ease and benefit of his followers, we might expect to find, that he had dropped some intimation of his design on one or other of those occasions, on which he was accused of breaking the sabbath, especially as he claimed to be Lord of the sabbath. As he gave no such intimation, his conduct must have led the Jews to conclude, that he was not commissioned to release them, on becoming his disciples, from the obligation they were under by the law to abstain from the pursuit of worldly business and pleasure on the sabbath, and to keep it holy to the Lord. It could not be necessary for him to ratify afresh an injunction of the law by an express command to show, that he did not intend to annul it. His own uniform compliance with it could be understood in no other light than a full acknowledgment, that it was still to remain in force with respect to the Jews, at least till the dissolution of their civil polity, if not afterwards. He censured with the greatest freedom the false glosses that had been put upon the law, and the absurd traditions by which it had been made void, but to the law itself he objected not: that, he said, he was not come to destroy. He, therefore, evidently approved of the Jewish converts observing the sabbath with the strictness really prescribed by the law.

Perhaps, as he foresaw and predicted the overthrow of the Jewish state, he might not esteem it necessary to command the Jewish converts to observe the sabbath after that event, when they
would

would be forced to discontinue some of their ceremonies, foreseeing that they would either look upon themselves as bound by the law and his example to do so, or that they would keep some other day holy to God, which being equally well calculated to answer all the religious and moral purposes of the sabbath, he might not think it needful to caution them against making such a change. But had he (whose zeal was so great for the public honour and worship of his heavenly Father, as to scourge from the temple those who profaned it by converting it into a place of merchandise) been aware that his followers would cease to regard one day above another in direct opposition to his own example, and to a practice which infinite wisdom had thought fit to injoin, in the most solemn manner, on all the people of his nation, he would doubtless have been particularly careful to guard them against so unprecedented and dangerous a conduct.

3. The apostles, after our Lord's ascension, acted in the same manner as he had done during his life-time. It was the manner of Paul in particular, that champion for the liberty of the gentile converts, to attend the synagogues every sabbath-day. In his speech before Festus he declares, that against the law he had not offended any thing at all. Now can we suppose, that the apostles would have continued to do as their master had done before them, if they had received any private instructions from him, or been directed by the Spirit, to weaken by degrees the attachment of the Jewish converts to any such practice, as that, in which they had been brought up, but which, on
account

account of its being, in fact, superstitious and injurious, was to be abolished? Would Paul especially, who so resolutely withstood the imposing spirit of the Jewish converts, not only have refrained from hinting to them, that they were no longer bound to observe any day as a sabbath, but also have countenanced their apprehension that they were so by his own conduct, had he been authorised to teach them a different doctrine? I know, that Eubulus hath brought a passage from the epistle to the Galatians, which he supposes to militate against such an inference as I have deduced from Paul's conduct; but I think, that your ingenious correspondent Hermas, in his paper on the perpetuity of the Jewish ritual, sect. 4th and 5th, hath shewn with respect to such casual expressions of the apostle, that they ought not to be rigorously understood, but candidly interpreted by the language of his behaviour, which should be taken into consideration, when we investigate the meaning of his words, that we may not let *these* and his *actions* at irreconcilable variance with each other. I, therefore, infer from the unequivocal declaration of Paul, Acts xxv. 8. xxviii. 17. and from his conduct and that of the other apostles, that they did not oppose, but countenance the observance of a weekly day of rest to be devoted to religious exercises, and that they did not object to the Jewish converts still keeping the sabbath.

4. There are plain traces of the observance of what is called the Lord's day in scripture, before the death of the apostles. On the day of Pentecost, which seems to have been the first day of the week (See Dr. Jennings's Jew. Ant. B 3. C. 5.)
the

the apostles and the hundred and twenty disciples were assembled (See Dr. Benson's *first planting of christianity*, B. I. C. I. Sect. 1.). On the first day of the week the disciples met together to break bread, Acts xx. 7. On the first day of the week every one was to lay by him in store for charitable uses, as God had prospered him, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. John was in the spirit on the Lord's day, Rev. i. 10.

From these passages it seems highly probable, that the first day of the week was particularly distinguished and regarded from the time of our Lord's resurrection, or at least very soon, if not immediately, after his ascension; and from the last of them it appears, that before the death of John it had obtained the name of *the Lord's day*. As John did nothing more than use the epithet κυριακή to distinguish the day he alluded to, and wrote for the use of christians in general, of that and all succeeding ages, it is evident, that he knew they wanted no other mark to discover what day he meant, and that, therefore, it was a name universally given to the first day at that time by christians. Now, as the *sabbath* was a name affixed to a particular day under the Jewish dispensation, to denote that it was a day of rest and public worship, it is probable that the first day of the week was called *the Lord's*, for the like reason. On the former the Jews had been delivered from bondage, and were, therefore, ordered to keep it holy; on the latter Jesus was manifested to be the son of God with power by his resurrection. As the apostles and the other Jewish converts had been accustomed to observe the former in commemoration of the divine mercy to their nation, I think it is likely, that

that, as the latter was distinguished by an event, which confirmed the divine mission of their Saviour, and on which their hopes rested, they celebrated it by abstaining from bodily labour, and joining in acts of social worship. If they thought proper to distinguish it at all by *any* religious notice, and the performance of a *particular* rite, on account of the most important of all events having taken place upon it, there is a probability, that as Jews, who had observed the sabbath in commemoration of a temporal deliverance in a very solemn manner, they kept the Lord's day with equal respect and reverence. And I think, that the first christians would hardly have given it the name of *the Lord's day*, if this had not been the case, and they had not conceived, that there was a peculiar propriety in their doing so in honour of their Saviour.

5. The word *church*, so frequently occurring in the scriptures of the New Testament, is allowed to signify assemblies of people called out and convened for some particular purpose. Now, whether the assemblies, meant by the word *church* in those writings, were held in a private house, and consisted only of the persons belonging to it (which seems to be sometimes the case) or were composed of several households, who met together in a place agreed upon among them, it cannot be doubted but that the object of their coming together was to engage in acts of social worship, and to enjoy the means of edification. What is said about churches leads to this idea. But I think, that the word *church* would not have been adopted, especially when there is a reference to a single household

household only, if it had not been designed to convey the idea of their uniting *at some stated time* in religious exercises, in a more *particular manner* than at others. The term would have been needlessly, if not improperly, employed, had it been intended to signify no more than a meeting of the members of a christian family to join in *daily devotion*. This every Jew must have understood to be a standing family duty, and would not have used himself, or expected to see used by others, a *particular* and seemingly *appropriate* term to distinguish the persons of a private house meeting to perform this common duty, equally incumbent upon all, from others. I therefore conceive, that this term suggests the idea of persons assembling on a *particular fixed day* for religious purposes. This day we shall see farther reason, as we proceed, to suppose to be *the Lord's day*.

6. Had not the first christians set apart some day of the week for religious worship, and held it sacred, their Jewish neighbours would have looked upon them as atheists. But where do we find that they regarded them in that light? The Jewish converts might continue to attend the synagogues on the sabbath, as well as keep the Lord's day. King produces evidence of both having been observed in the eastern churches in the time of Origen. Enquiry into the Constitution, &c. Pt. 2. ch. 7. sect. 11.

7. As it cannot be disputed, that churches were formed in various parts of the world in the days of the apostles, so there are many strong indications, not yet noticed, of their observing a day for religious purposes. In the churches of Lystra, Iconium,

Iconium, and Antioch, Paul and Barnabas ordained elders, *i. e.* some of the earliest converts of those cities, who had been most fully instructed, and were, therefore, best qualified to teach others. But for what end did they appoint such officers, if there was not a *particular time* for the exercise of their function. There is not the shadow of a reason, as far as I can discover, for supposing, that the apostles took them off entirely from secular pursuits (as we shall by and by see they did) to be every day employed in nothing but going from house to house to teach, which in the day-time would have occasioned an interruption of business. And if they had made their pastoral visits when the business of the day was over, which perhaps they frequently did, where would have been the necessity, unless for a purpose hereafter to be mentioned, for their not working themselves in the day? As, then, elders were ordained, and being invested with an office, did, no doubt, at some time or other, discharge the duties of it, and that probably not at seasons when they must have called off the members of their flocks from their worldly business, it was doubtless more peculiarly at a time when they were at leisure to attend to their instructions, and used to meet to celebrate the Lord's supper, *i. e.* on the Lord's day. But of this I proceed to adduce farther proof.

Paul tells the Corinthians (1 Ep. ch. xi. v. 18) that *he heard there were divisions among them, when they met together in the church.* On what day they were accustomed to meet there is clearly pointed

pointed out by a circumstance mentioned in the 20th verse, where the apostle says, *when ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper*; for the supper no where appears, as I remember, to have been eaten on any other than the Lord's day. As on this day the Corinthian converts used to assemble to commemorate the death of Christ, so likewise to perform other duties of religion; for we read in the 14th chapter, of prophesying, praying, and singing in the church, which the apostle speaks of as acts in which they engaged when they met, which no doubt was on the day that they partook of the Lord's supper, in the celebration of which he had charged them with being guilty of great indecencies. For, as he is still pursuing one subject, and giving directions with respect to behaviour and the management of offices to be performed in the church, there can be no just ground for supposing that he refers to any *other* day. On this day, therefore, they prophesied, prayed, and sung, as well as celebrated the rite of the supper. Now what probability is there, that all these duties were crowded together into the compass of an hour after the christians of Corinth had finished the labours of the day. The apostle permitted two, or three, or even all of the prophets to speak *one by one*, ver. 29 and 31; and as prophesying was for the edification of those who believed, ver. 22, it probably consisted of instructions relating to christian doctrines and duties, which it might employ the prophets some considerable time to illustrate and enforce. This part of the
public

public service, together with the others of praying, singing, and distributing the elements of the supper among the communicants, surely filled up more than an hour, if they were all done *decently, and in order*, and might easily furnish employment for as many hours as are now usually allotted for the public services of the Lord's day.

Paul, in his first epistle to Timothy, ch. v. ver. 18. commands, *Let the elders, that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, especially those, who labour in the word and doctrine.* That the apostle comprehended, under the word *honour*, some recompence for the services done the church, is manifest from the next verse, which is introduced with the conjunction *for*, to shew that he is going to produce a reason for the command he had immediately before delivered. His words are, *For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox, that treadeth out the corn; and, the labourer is worthy of his reward.* But in his first epistle to the Corinthians, ch. ix. ver. 14. he says expressly, The Lord hath ordained, *that they who preach the gospel*, which I conceive to mean the same as *labouring in the word and doctrine, should live of the gospel.* Now can it be at all likely, either that elders should be called off from worldly occupations, which, had they pursued them as other christians who were not appointed to any spiritual office, would have been the means of supplying their bodily wants without their being at all burdensome to the church, if all they had been to do were occasionally to visit the flock, and attend at the meeting of

their brethren an hour before the work of the day began, or after it was ended, which, according to Eubulus, could not require any interruption of secular pursuits, to assist at the celebration of the Lord's supper, and to deliver a few brief instructions—or that, if they were, and were thereby thrown upon the bounty of the church for their subsistence, in return for so small a service, it would not have been warmly objected to, as a thing highly unreasonable and oppressive?

Perhaps Eubulus may say, that an objection of this kind was started against the apostles in the Corinthian church, as he may think it implied by Paul's question, *If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?* 1 Cor. ix. 11. But the apostle's reply in the words immediately following is founded on their concession, that others had a right to share in their carnal things, or at least in their readily consenting that they should do so, *If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather?* However, he chose himself to wave the exercise of his right, that he might not hinder the success of the gospel. It therefore appears to be very evident, that the first christians submitted to have public teachers established among them with the incumbrance of providing for their support, though the apostles had no worldly power to force them to such a submission; and from this circumstance it is highly probable, that the service performed by those teachers was something more than administering the Lord's supper, and giving some brief instructions, at the beginning or close of a day,

day, the *rest* of which was employed in temporal affairs.

Farther, Paul tells Timothy, 2 epist. ch. ii. ver. 4. that *no man, that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life*: from which he would have him infer, that *he* ought to have nothing to do with worldly business. And that not only an evangelist, which Timothy was, but likewise all who preached the gospel, were to act in the same manner, may be concluded from the apostle's comparing those who preached the gospel, with those who under the law *ministered about holy things, and waited at the altar*, in order to prove that the former were entitled to a livelihood, as were the latter, by virtue of their office, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. For his reasoning would have been inconclusive, had not the one been taken off, as were the other, from secular employments. Moreover, the words *live by the gospel* either signified nothing, or that the persons, of whom they were spoken, were to derive the whole of their subsistence from preaching the gospel, without gaining a part of it by other means. Now, is it at all likely, that the apostle, who preferred death to parting with that glory, to which he conceived himself entitled for having preached the gospel *gratis* to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. ix. 15. would have himself acquiesced in, much less have countenanced, the institution of an order of persons in the church to be maintained by its bounty, and asserted the expedience, if not necessity, of their abstaining from all worldly pursuits, merely that they might be at liberty to spend an hour once a week to promote the religious and moral improvement of their fellow-christians, and that at a time,

D 2

when

when the engagements of business would have been otherwise suspended? Did they want all the rest of the week to prepare for the discharge of so short a service; or was it more inconsistent with the nature of *their* office, than with the *superior one* of an apostle, to work with their hands to get a living?

No doubt, the end to be answered by their keeping themselves free from the entanglements of the affairs of this life was, that they might devote their time to *reading and study*, agreeably to the apostle's charge to Timothy, that they might be *scribes well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, able rightly to divide the word of truth*, capable of guiding the devotions of the people, and thus qualified for performing, with propriety and usefulness, services which occupied a much larger portion of a certain day than Eubulus supposes to have been then employed in any public acts of a religious nature. And I remark, that this day must have been *the Lord's day*, when christians met to commemorate his death, and not the Jewish sabbath; since it is not supposable, that the elders were allowed to discharge the duties, which it hath been already shewn they were appointed to discharge, in *synagogues*, unless all the Jews, who assembled in them, were become converts to christianity, which *probably* was not *any where, certainly not every where*, the case, where elders were ordained.

The author of the epistle to the Hebrews (probably Paul) in his charge to those to whom he wrote, not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, x. 25. and James, in forbidding a preference to be shown to persons, who came
into

into their assembly with a gold ring and in goodly apparel, ii. 2. are, if I mistake not, generally thought, and on good grounds, to refer to the public meetings then held by christians on the Lord's day for social worship. These writers, from the very nature of the subjects they wrote about, can be supposed to speak of none but *religious* meetings, and in no other meetings of that kind could christians have a right to manage but such as consisted of christians. These, therefore, were the meetings which the writer to the Hebrews enjoined them not to forsake, and in which James forbids any partiality to be discovered. And as christians confessedly met on the first day to commemorate the death of their Lord, it was no doubt to the meetings held on that occasion, that both referred.

Peter, speaking of the views with which elders ought to take the oversight of the flock, says, that they should do it *not for filthy lucre's sake, but of a ready mind*, 1 Eph. v. 2. *i. e.* that worldly gain should not be their leading object in undertaking their office. From hence it also appears, that there were elders, that Peter approved of the institution of such an order of men, and that they were in some way or other rewarded by their flocks for their labours among them; from all which the same inferences follow as have been already deduced from the same circumstances mentioned by Paul.

Upon an impartial review of the evidence now produced, I cannot but think it sufficient to prove, that a day was set apart every week in the times of the apostles for religious purposes,

D 3

that

that this day was *the Lord's day*, and that no worldly business was done upon it.

To prove that the Lord's day was observed in the same strictly religious manner in the following ages, prior to the days of Constantine, I have no need to quote passages from the writers of that period of time, this being already done to my hands by several, to some of whom I beg leave to refer. See particularly Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Art. 5. p. 263—266, Ed. 9. King's Enquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church, Pt. 2. where any one may see not only numerous proofs of the observance of the Lord's day, but also an account of the religious duties performed in the church in the first ages. Dr. Whitby, on 1 Cor. xvi. 2. With respect to what was done in the church on the Lord's day, see also Dr. Benson's Essay, annexed to his paraphrase on 2 Tim.

Though what I have now advanced be, according to my present opinion, enough to vindicate the practice of christians in observing a day of religious rest, from the charge of being superstitious, yet it may not be amiss to examine Eubulus's objections to this practice, one by one, that nothing he hath said may be left unanswered. This I may do in a future paper, if you will give me leave, and I should not find it done before by some other person.

I am, Gentlemen,
Your very humble Servant,
PHILANDER.

Obfer-

Observations on the Divine Mission of Moses.

[Continued from Vol. V. p. 384.]

IN consequence of having received a hint from a very learned and judicious friend, who saw the foregoing paper after it was drawn up, I beg leave to make the following addition to it.

The attentive reader will observe, that in what I have already done, I have reasoned from effects to causes, attempting to show from undisputed facts the high probability of the truth of the miraculous events and appearances recorded in the Old Testament; by proving that the former do not appear to have had any adequate causes, if the reality of the latter be denied. I now proceed in a different way to gain the same point, and take notice,

1. That Jesus refers to the account of Noah and the flood, to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the story of Lot's wife, to the appearance which Moses saw in the bush, and the words spoken to him from thence, to the affair of the brazen serpent, to the stories of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath, of Elisha and Naaman, of Jonah and the Ninevites, &c. and to the Jewish scriptures in general, in a manner which plainly shows, that he thought them *authentic*. The like we find to be done by Stephen and Paul, in their abridgments of the principal events recorded in the history of their nation.

Now Mathetes will undoubtedly own, that there is a great difference between reasoning with an opponent on his own principles, though known to be false, in order to confute him and bring him

to acknowledge the truth of conclusions, which may be drawn from principles that are *certainly* just, and speaking of matters of *fact* as *real*, when at the same time they are disbelieved or doubted by the speaker. In the former case, a person doth, and is understood to do, no more than concede for a time the truth of principles held by an antagonist, with the reservation of a right to deny them, if he should find that he cannot use them with success: in the latter, giving no intimation that he doubts the facts, but on the contrary producing them as parts of genuine history and objects of his own belief, he is chargeable with knowingly advancing direct falsehoods, if he do *not* believe them. This is an imputation which no christian will fix on the character of Jesus or his apostles. Such an one must, therefore, grant that they *believed* the facts which they quoted from the Old Testament.

The christian of Mathetes may think, that they gave credit to those facts on no better evidence than the rest of their countrymen, the sufficiency of which he would call in question; and that, therefore, their belief of them will not merit any regard, but that they ought to be rejected, unless the truth of them can be established by evidence independent of their assertions. Such independent evidence hath been already produced in the preceding paper. But I cannot help thinking, that their credibility is increased by the testimony of honest men, who lived almost 2000 years nearer to the times in which they are said to have happened, to some of whom at least it is likely the same objections would have occurred as to any modern, and who were in more advantageous situations

situations for examining into their authenticity. The apostles in particular (and our Saviour likewise) could not want motives to prompt them to make such an examination. *One* readily presents itself to our minds. As they could not but know, that they were endued with miraculous gifts and powers, which *alone* enabled them to give ample proof, that the religion they were propagating was divine, and as they were always meeting with the most violent opposition from the Jews, it is natural to suppose, that if they could on good grounds have controverted the truth of facts, in which their enemies gloried, and which really, *in one view*, reflected honour on their nation, they would have done it, both as men of integrity, and out of zeal for the religion which they were sent to publish. Paul especially, one would imagine, who is acknowledged to have been a man of vigorous understanding and considerable literature, who was most cruelly treated by the Jews, and who had frequent occasions to remark the superiority of the christian to the Jewish religion in several respects, would have felt himself strongly impelled to expose the credulity of his adversaries, and to strip them of their boasted honours. Nothing of this sort, however, do we meet with, but the quite *contrary*.

2. Our Lord plainly asserts the divine authority of the law. He declares, that one iota or tittle of it should not pass till the whole was fulfilled. He severely condemns any one, who should break the least of the commandments he quotes from it, and should teach men so; and pronounces him great in the kingdom of heaven, who should do and teach them. He sends the cleansed leper to the

the priest to offer the gift commanded by Moses. He expressly calls it a transgression of the commandment of *God* (a commandment received from *Moses*) to say to a parent, It is a gift, &c. He enumerates several precepts from the decalogue with the highest approbation. He points out the two great commandments of the law. In each case he acts as one who thought, that the commandments he enforced were recommended not only by their own *excellence*, but also by *the authority of the Jewish lawgiver*. In his temptation he proves the unlawfulness of worshipping any other being besides God, and of presumptuously relying on the care of providence, by an appeal to two precepts delivered by Moses, and that when he is perfectly alone. He tells the Jews, that Moses accused them to the Father, because, had they believed that man, their admired prophet, they would have believed him. He argues the resurrection from the dead in reply to the Sadducees, from words spoken by God to Moses out of the bush. He represents Abraham, in his parable of the rich man and Lazarus, as bearing, in a state of *superior* knowledge, the most honourable testimony to Moses and the prophets, and as putting the authority and influence of their teachings upon a level, at least, with those of the teachings of a person raised from the dead, and sent by God on purpose to reform the living.

Now is it possible that one who allows the divine mission of Jesus, should suppose, that he would have ascribed divine authority, in so unequivocal a manner, to Moses and the prophets, if they had not been really honoured with it?

But

But if a christian could imagine, that, for some reason or other, he chose, during his ministry, to indulge his *countrymen in general* in their ill-founded prejudices, could he think, that he would not have attempted to remove those prejudices by degrees from the minds of his *constant attendants*, or that, if he judged it proper to leave *these also* under their dominion to the time of his *death*, he would not after his *resurrection* have dropped some hint of their being groundless, in his conversation with the two disciples, whom he joined on their way to Emmaus (the *reverse* of which was the fact) at some interview with the whole body of his apostles, or in those plenary instructions, which Paul assures us he received from him? I do not see how it is reconcileable with the plain and open manner of Jesus and his apostles to suppose, that the former left the latter both before and after his death, and that the latter, during the whole of their ministry after our Lord's ascension, continued to leave all their countrymen, as he had done during the whole of his, under a delusion so unfavourable to the spread of the gospel among them, if it had been indeed a delusion.

It is unreasonable to suppose, that Jesus and his apostles were *themselves* suffered to labour under such a delusion through the whole of their lives. They were commissioned to preach a new religion. It cannot, therefore, be doubted, but that it constituted as much a part of their business to labour the overthrow of what was wrong, and unwarranted by any divine authority in the *jewish religion* (of which sort its ritual in
par-

particular must have been, had it not been prescribed by God) as to destroy *paganism*. The religion of Moses, however, they never threw any contempt upon, as if it had been a contrivance of human policy, though they unreservedly condemned the corruptions of it, to which the Jews appear to have been as much attached as to the genuine injunctions of their lawgiver. On the contrary, they always treated it with the respect due to a divine institution, and conformed themselves to its requirements. The whole of *paganism* the apostles spoke of as absurd superstition, arising from human ignorance and blindness.

1, therefore, infer, that the characters of Jesus and the apostles; the object of their mission to subvert false religion; their total silence, notwithstanding, as to the law of Moses not having been from God, while they most freely condemned human traditions incorporated with it; their own conformity to the law; the apostles, particularly Paul's, setting forth *paganism* as mere folly and superstition.---I infer, I say, that all these conspire strongly to prove the law of Moses to have been from God, and the miraculous works and appearances, by which it is said to have been at first introduced, and afterwards, from time to time, confirmed and supported, to have really happened.

3. It is probable, that, if the law had not been from God, Paul in particular would have been enabled and authorised to shew that it had not been so. In propagating christianity among the Gentiles he met with constant opposition and persecution

persecution from the Jews. Now, what an advantage would it have given him over those adversaries, if, instead of pleading a respect for their law, he could have proved it a mere human contrivance? It is true, the Jews pretended to found their opposition to him on his being a pestilent and seditious fellow. However, when he had shown the Gentiles that the opposition arose in fact only from their zeal for a religion as divine, which appeared to have no proper evidence to justify its claim to such a title, they would probably have been better disposed towards him, and not have paid much regard to the malicious suggestions of his enemies. And his doing this would not have impaired the evidence, which he had to produce in favour of christianity. The argument from prophecy would have carried no weight with it, had it been proposed to Gentiles, and accordingly we do not find it to have been urged to them. He could, therefore, have had no inducement to suppress any arguments, by which he might have exposed the absurd credulity of his adversaries, and so have gained a considerable advantage over them. The difficulties he had to surmount, in procuring attention from the Gentiles, would have been much lessened. It, therefore, seems likely, that he would have been both enabled, and inclined, to adopt such a measure. No such measure, however, did he take, or appear able, or authorised, to take, which seems to be an argument, not only that he was himself convinced, but that the great Being who employed him, countenanced the idea, that the

the law was, what its advocates pretended it to be, divine.

4. We read in the account of our Lord's transfiguration, that Moses and Elias appeared to him and his three companions on the mount, and foretold his decease, which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem, and that a voice proceeded from the cloud (which was esteemed a symbol of the divine presence) saying, This is my beloved son. Now I ask, can any christian suppose, that God would have employed, on this solemn and interesting, or, indeed, on any occasion, a deceiver, as Moses must have been, had not the religion he introduced been divine; have accompanied him with what was regarded as a mark of his presence; and moreover have pronounced Jesus at the same time to be his beloved son? Must not such a transaction have necessarily confirmed Jesus and his disciples in their misapprehensions of the real characters of Moses and Elijah? If the voice from the cloud was a divine testimony to the claims of Jesus to the title of a *new law-giver* from God, was it not also, in conjunction with the other circumstances attending this event, a proof that Moses was what they had always thought him, a *former lawgiver* from the same Being?

5. I observe that Jesus speaks of himself as the Messiah foretold in the prophetic writings of the Jews, and that the apostles after him uniformly represent him in the same light. That a particular person *was* predicted under that character by the prophets, is seen in their writings; and
that

that Jesus *was* that person hath been often shewn from the correspondence of the time and other circumstances of his appearance to those which had been foretold of the Messiah. A correspondence between a particular event, and a prediction which was to be fulfilled within a specified time, and can be applied to no other event happening within that time, is esteemed a complete proof that the *former* is the very thing spoken of in the *latter*; and the fulfilment of a number of particular circumstances, which must have been quite out of the reach of human foresight, is allowed to be a no less proof, that the prediction was *inspired by that Being* who hath all events at his disposal. Thus much being granted, the right of the Jewish prophets to the title of *men*, or *servants of God*, must be indisputable, and what they said and did in *that capacity* must challenge the highest credit and regard. Now we know that they professed the greatest veneration for the law, conformed themselves to its institutions, and declared themselves sent to admonish and reprove their countrymen for neglects and violations of it. Thus having before us so clear evidence of their mission, in the accomplishment of the most remarkable and important of their predictions, and being so fully informed of a leading object of that mission, and of their own religious sentiments and practice, how is it possible to avoid acknowledging, that we have a testimony to the divine original of the law, supported by authority derived from God himself?

But, independently of this mode of reasoning; in which, however, I do not perceive any fallacy; the mere circumstance of a person's having been foretold, at different times, and by different persons of the Jewish nation, under the title of *the son of man* and *the Messiah*, and of our Lord's arising in that nation, claiming that title, and answering so fully, as to the time of his appearance, his outward condition, his office, his actions, and the treatment he met with, to the descriptions given of those things by the Jewish prophets, must excite, one would think, in the mind of a christian, an idea of the closest connection subsisting between the christian and Mo-
saic dispensations; so that the former being allowed to be from God, it seems unaccountable that the latter should at the same time be denied a like origin. Prediction under the one; and accomplishment under the other, so unite the two to each other, that they manifestly shew themselves to be only parts of the same scheme; and to have one and the same author:

Perhaps other considerations could be adduced to prove that a christian hath not only no reason for denying the reality of supernatural intercourses with the Deity in the earlier ages of the world, or the divine authority of the law or prophets, but that some of the very principles on which his belief of christianity is founded, and that belief itself, lead directly to the acknowledgment of both. But I shall not have recourse at present to any others, trusting that those which have been already suggested, will be found

sufficient for the purpose. I will only observe, by way of conclusion, that, if there be the force, which I think there is, in the preceding arguments, the intelligent reader will agree with me in this remark, namely, that a christian of the description given by Mathetes must involve himself in difficulties altogether insurmountable.

A CHRISTIAN.

On the Connexion between Faith in the divine Mission of Christ, and that of Moses and the Prophets.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

NOTwithstanding the compass and force of argument, with which your correspondent, A CHRISTIAN, hath, in a preceding article, replied to MATHETES: I conceive there is yet room left for some remarks on his *general question*, on which A CHRISTIAN hath not particularly animadverted.

MATHETES, on the supposition that the stories in the Old Testament, may to some appear improbable, the miracles incredible; and the Jewish law ever to have had no more a divine commission than Lycurgus or Zoroaster—asks, “Whether it be necessary that a person with these conceptions should be an unbeliever in Jesus Christ?”

Vol. VI. E How

How far it is possible to separate a belief in the divine mission of Moses and in the inspiration of the prophets from a faith in christianity; how far it is possible for the same person to reject the former while he holds the latter, need not be investigated, nor disputed. For that the human mind is capable of amazing inconsistencies and extravagancies, in speculation as well as in conduct, may be readily admitted. Numerous facts prove it to a degree, beyond what we should in theory conceive to be probable, or even possible.

But the question, I apprehend, should be, Whether it be a natural, consistent thing, to own the divine mission of Christ, and discard that of Moses; whether the latter, if brought to the test of human actions, be compatible with the former; agreeable to the principles on which we believe in Christ—and congruous to the sentiments and obligations, which that belief implies.

Your judicious correspondent, A CHRISTIAN, hath, in my opinion, excellently shewn, that “the fact of our Lord’s resurrection, and the miracles recorded in the Old Testament, rest on the same *kind*, though they may not rest on the same *degree* of the same kind of evidence;” and that it is difficult to conceive “how it should happen, that several of the same kind of arguments, which induce a man to believe that fact, should not strike him, as being applicable to miraculous facts recorded in the Old Testament, and induce him to believe them also.”

I can add nothing on this head to the full and close reasonings of A CHRISTIAN. The point
to

to which it is here wished to engage the attention of MATHETES, is the incongruity of the conduct he states with the sentiments and obligations; which faith in the divine mission of Christ implies. Where this is admitted, a peculiar veneration of his character, and a great deference to his judgment, must be felt. Nay, to acquiesce in his decisions, and to acknowledge the truth of his declarations, is, in all reason and fitness, as closely connected with a belief in his divine mission, as obedience to the rules he laid down.

MATHETES grants, that there are passages in the christian scriptures, which are expressive of a belief in the miracles of the Old Testament, and in the divine mission of Moses, being entertained by Christ and his apostles; and that the popular persuasion was on that side. But he supposes, that it was not requisite, that Christ, or his apostles, should have had any information concerning the mission of Moses, superior to that which was enjoyed by their countrymen; and that, therefore, they naturally fell in with the popular opinion.

It is to be wished that MATHETES had taken, and placed before us a more comprehensive view of the subject, on which he forms his *Queries*; *that* might perhaps have superseded his queries. The passages to which he slightly alludes are many, very many; more numerous than it is probable MATHETES was aware of.

There are more than five hundred places, in which the writers of the New Testament quote and argue from those of the Old: and the attestations of the former to the divine authority

of the latter are as clear and strong, as can well be conceived. Let the appeal be made to these testimonies; and then the question will be, whether they can be disregarded and rejected, consistently with a belief of the divine authority of those who deliver them? consistently with the sentiments of respect and submission avowedly entertained for their characters, and really due to them.

Remarkable is the solemn declaration in which Christ speaks of the reference that his own mission and office bore to Moses and the prophets: it is very expressive of *his* reverence to both, and of his regard to them, as acting under a divine commission. ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.’ Matt. v. 18. Remarkable is the manner in which he hath closely blended together his own divine mission with that of Moses, in one of the most full, explicit, and argumentative discourses which he ever held with the Jews on his own claims. ‘Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me. Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, *even* Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?’ John v. 39. 45, 46, 47. Remarkable is the attestation given to Moses and the prophets by Christ, in the person of Abraham: ‘They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear

‘hear them: if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.’ Luke xvi. 29. 31.

Remarkable was the evidence to the dependence of christianity on Judaism, which was gloriously exhibited on the mount of transfiguration: When ‘there appeared Moses and Elias talking with Jesus.’ Matt. xvii. 3. Remarkable was the sanction afforded to the popular persuasion, concerning the mission of Moses and the prophets, and of the connexion of christianity with them, by the conversation which Christ had with the disciples going to Emmaus, after his resurrection from the dead: when ‘he said unto them, O! fools, and slow of heart, to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself.” Luke xxiv. 25, 26, 27. Is this the language, on the review of these passages, it may be asked? Is this the conduct of one who merely entertained the popular persuasion? Is it not the conduct and language of one who knew whereof he affirmed; who spoke from well grounded conviction; who, in connexion with the illumination he had concerning his own claims, had received information concerning the mission of Moses and the prophets, beyond the ideas which his own countrymen, or even the apostles, then enjoyed: information, not of the falsehood of their claims, but of the divine authority by which they spake,

and of the extensive, remote, and sublime import and design of what they said ?

Throughout the epistles there is a perpetual reference to the state of things preceding the gospel ; which is always spoken of as originating from God ; as conducted and directed by him, and as receiving its completion and finishing by Christ. The scriptures of the Old Testament are spoken of as “ the oracles of God,” and as writings able to make the reader “ wise unto “ salvation ;” the Jews are represented as an highly favoured people, to whom pertained ‘ the ‘ adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, ‘ and the giving of the law, and the service of ‘ God, and the promises :’ the ‘ law is said to be ‘ a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ :’ and the same God, who hath in these last days spoken to us by his son, is declared ‘ at sundry times ‘ and in divers manners, to have spoken in times ‘ past unto the fathers by the prophets ;’ and that ‘ prophecy came not in old time by the will of ‘ man ; but holy men of God spake as they were ‘ moved by the Holy Ghost.’

When these attestations to the divine authority of Moses and the prophets by Christ and the apostles are considered, how inconsistent it may be said, how irreverent is it, to admit the truth of their claims, and yet to reject, in that instance, their testimonies ! If they be not to be credited here, they must have laboured under a gross and constant delusion : their reasonings were not merely unguardedly expressed, or inconclusively drawn, but founded on false premises ; conducive to error, and subservient to the authority

thority of an imposture, which had for ages misled and blinded the Jewish nation. The mind revolts from these suppositions.

If Moses had no more a divine commission than Lycurgus or Zoroaster, if prophecy came from the will of men, Moses and the prophets were impostors and deceivers of the people ; for it cannot be denied, that they spake not in their own names, but in the name of God, and laid claims to a divine commission.

Now, when it is conceived, as MATTHEW states it, that the single fact of the resurrection of Christ is of itself sufficient to establish the truth of his doctrine, can it be supposed that Christ, acting under a divine commission, arguing upon his claims, and appealing to his miracles, as especially in the 5th of John, should be left by the God of truth to encumber the evidences of his own mission with the dubious claims of another : nay, should be left to lie under a popular error of so much moment, as must be a groundless belief of the divine mission of Moses and the prophets, and to leave it on the minds of his apostles, more strongly rivetted by his discourses with them after his resurrection ; should be left to derive weight to his own claims from the declarations of an impostor, and to give his sanction to characters which had deluded the world ?

In proportion as the excellence of his own doctrine and character carried their own recommendations along with them ; in proportion as his miracles, and especially his resurrection, were in themselves convincing evidences of his own divine authority, the improbability of his being left to

avail himself of a popular persuasion, which was founded in falsehood, and a falsehood of peculiar malignity, is increased; and the danger of it to the general cause of truth is heightened: as the popular persuasion was less necessary to the support of his cause, and would receive a new and peculiar sanction from his use of it. The same reasoning will apply to his apostles.

Our Lord, it should be also considered, was free and severe in the charges which he brought against the scribes and pharisees, for corrupting the religion of Moses, and mixing with it their own superstitions and traditions: these he saw; these, as a prophet, he reproved. Can it be imagined, that if he felt a divine impulse to censure the corruptions of a false religion, he would not have had information concerning the falsehood of that religion itself; and a commission to expose it? This was the great, this was the original evil.

The manner, it should be further observed, in which Christ and his apostles speak of Moses and the prophets, is a very different thing from the language that, it is allowed, they used on some other subjects, and which intimates that they had received no peculiar information or commission concerning them, and were probably in the popular opinion. The language, in these cases, particularly in that of the Demoniacs, is only incidental, and descriptive of appearances, and not at all affecting the truth and credibility of the transaction it expresses. But their testimonies to Moses and the prophets form essential parts of their discourses: nay, constitute the
very

very subject of which they treat; and are of main consequence to their argument. In the former case, the popular language which is used, affects only the mode or hidden cause of a fact: in the latter the whole truth, the fact itself is involved.

I would add, that admitting the divine authority of Moses and the prophets, and the dependence of christianity upon Judaism, honour is reflected upon the former, as the grand result of all the divine dispensations through the preceding ages of the world. From the contemplation of all, as forming one great, benevolent plan, the parts of which harmoniously conspire gradually to raise human nature to the utmost perfection of which it is capable, there arises a distinct and striking evidence of the divine authority of the Jewish and the christian religions.

On the whole, the Christian who throws off the Mosaic revelation, must conceive of Christ, in the first instance, and of the apostles in the next, as lying under an error of the first magnitude; as being left, for want of information superior to that which was enjoyed by their countrymen, to give the strongest attestations to falsehood and imposture. Whether such conceptions be consistent with the belief of the divine mission of Christ; whether they must not weaken the weight of his authority, and, in some degree, undermine that veneration and submission, which faith in him dictates, let MATTHEW reflect.

In my opinion, an observation relative to the Ebionites, to be met with in a late very valuable work, is justly applicable here. "Our Saviour's acknowledgment of the authority of the whole
" of

“ of the Old Testament, is so express, that I
 “ cannot readily believe that any christians, ac-
 “ knowledging his authority, would reject what
 “ he admitted*.”

If the preceding remarks should be judged
 worthy of a place in your Repository, it will gratify,

Gentlemen,

Your humble servant,

MOSAICUS.

P. S. PHILOLOGUS CHRISTIANUS may be
 pleased with seeing the following passages, from
 a very scarce work, in support of his own cri-
 tique on John i. 1. “ For the honour of St.
 “ *John*, and the *christian religion* too, it is most
 “ reasonable to suppose, that in St. *John's original*
 “ it was written not Θεός *ἦν* ὁ Λόγος, but Θεοῦ *ἦν* ὁ Λόγος,
 “ And so the sense of St. *John* is,—*In*, or at *the*
 “ *beginning* (of the gospel) *was the Word*, that
 “ is, the preacher, the great publisher and in-
 “ terpreter of God's will; and *this Preacher*
 “ *was with God*: that is, *intimate in the favour*
 “ *of the knowledge of the will of God*; and then it
 “ is added,—*and this was God's preacher*. This
 “ reading is confirmed by St. *John himself*, who
 “ expressly tells us, that Christ's name was, or hath
 “ been called, in my gospel, &c.—Ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ,

* PRIESTLEY's *History of early Opinions concerning JESUS CHRIST*, vol. iii. p. 418.

“ *the*

“ *the word of God*, that is, *the preacher of God’s*
 “ *word*, or *the publisher of God’s will*.—And
 “ this character of *Jesus Christ* is confirmed by
 “ his *whole ministry*, through all the *four Gospels* :
 “ in which we find *Christ* very often declaring,
 “ that *the doctrine* he taught, and the words he
 “ spoke were not his own, but *his that sent him*,
 “ I am doing nothing from myself (saith Christ)
 “ *but as my Father hath taught me*, those things I
 “ am speaking. *The word which ye are hearing*
 “ is not mine, *but the FATHER’S WHO HATH*
 “ SENT ME,

“ If the reading in the *Alexandrian MS.**
 “ (Rev. xix. 13,) be preferred to the *text* in the
 “ other *Greek* copies, then St. *John* seems to inti-
 “ mate that *Christ had been named*, or *called the*
 “ *WORD of GOD* ; by himself and others too.
 “ If, I say, that be the true reading of the text,
 “ then it is no remote, but a reasonable conjec-
 “ ture, that *Jesus Christ* might be *commonly named*,
 “ spoken of, and mentioned by this distinctive
 “ character,—*the Word of God*. As he is also
 “ called *the Christ of God*, Luke ix, 20. 1 Cor.
 “ iii. 23. and, *the Power of God* : and *the Wis-*
 “ *dom of God*, 1 Cor, i. 24. and *the Lord’s Christ*,
 “ and *God’s Christ*,” Rev. xi. 15, ch. xii. 10.

The *Scripture Account of the Attributes and*
Worship of God : and of the Character and Offices
of JESUS CHRIST. By a candid enquirer after
 TRUTH (i. e. Hopton Haynes, Esq.) p. 8, 9,
 1750,

* *Kodex.*

On

*On the Oblation of Isaac, as figurative of the
Death of Christ.*

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

BEFORE we can consider any two events under the relation of type and antitype, it is necessary to discover that the Almighty designed to prefigure the one by the other: or at least to point out not only a similarity of one or two circumstances in each, but a more than casual correspondence throughout. When both these conditions are wanting, we cannot but suspect that the reference they are supposed to bear to each other is purely imaginary, and by no means countenanced by proper authority. The word type, signifies a mould, pattern, or die (see Taylor on Rom. vi. 17; Sykes on Heb. ix. 24.) and the word antitype, the figure cast in that mould, formed after that pattern, or stamped with that die. In printing, the word type is used in its proper sense; the antitype is the character formed on the paper. These terms, therefore, import an exact and perfect mutual resemblance. If it be urged, that Paul calls Adam a type of Christ, Rom. v. 14. when there was only one similar circumstance, and many dissimilarities between them, I answer, that the apostle

apostle uses the word *τυπος*, in a sense very different from the present theological one, and never meant to insinuate that the Almighty designed to prefigure, or obscurely predict the universal resurrection, by the introduction of universal mortality. According to him, *τυπος*, type, conveys only the idea of casual resemblance.

It is generally admitted, that the *intended* sacrifice of Isaac is to be understood as prefiguring the death of Jesus upon the cross. But upon impartial examination, I imagine it will be allowed that this opinion is void of support, both from the express declarations of scripture, and from a proper coincidence in their respective circumstances.

No one will assert that Moses, throughout the whole narration, gives any reason to suppose this injunction laid on the patriarch to bear any prophetic reference to the death of Jesus: or that any one of the evangelists, in their accounts of the crucifixion, either expressly mentions, or in the most distant manner alludes to the offering of Isaac. Had their ideas been similar to ours, is it credible they should all have omitted any thing so remarkable, especially as the Almighty is recorded in Genesis, to have promised Abraham that seed in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed; and as, on the other hand, Abraham is frequently spoken of in the gospels. He is quoted as rejoicing to see Christ's day—as being a very different character from his descendants, our Lord's contemporaries. Nay, St. Paul often celebrates his faith, in consequence of
which

which he was justified*; and his trust in God, which reconciled him to offer his son: but never once does he suggest the resemblance that the oblation of Isaac is imagined to have borne to the murder of our Lord. Nor will it diminish our surprise to reflect that the evangelists have been minute in collecting every thing that appeared to them of consequence: as what was said concerning the paschal lamb, which bore a small and very distant resemblance to our Lord †, ‘A bone of it shall not be broken.’ (Ex. d. xii. 46.) and through a desire of accommodating themselves as much as possible to the Old Testament, have cited (John xix. 24.) what David said of himself, ‘They parted my garment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots.’ Who, then, would expect that such a leading prophetic event as this of Isaac is supposed to have

* Gen. xv. 6. ‘And Abraham believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness.’ i. e. God in his turn looked on Abraham, *at that instant*, as a righteous man; his past sins were done away, in reward of his present confidence in the divine promises sufficiently authenticated. No intimation is here given, that faith is a substitute for moral virtue; or that even Abraham’s faith would indemnify him from the punishment of subsequent guilt, or unconditionally secure his happiness after death.

† The sprinkling the blood of the lamb upon the doorposts, was a **TOKEN** of the Israelites’ obedience, and occasioned their exemption from the general slaughter. Believing in Christ was a **TOKEN** of his disciples’ obedience; and rescued them from the wrath of God incurred by their **PAST** sins. See Sykes on Heb. Appendix 11. In this, therefore, the similarity between Christ and the Paschal lamb subsisted, that they were both **MEANS** of preserving the obedient from a general calamity.

been,

been, could possibly escape their particular notice?

It must not, however, be concealed, that from John viii. 56. Bishop Warburton (Div. Leg. B. 6. sect. 5. 2d edit.) undertakes to shew, that when God says to Abraham, 'Take now thy son, &c.' the command is merely an information, by action instead of words, of the great sacrifice for the redemption of mankind, given at the earnest request of Abraham, who longed impatiently to see Christ's day. The Bishop's words are, 'Abraham rejoiced, saith Jesus, to see my day, *την ημεραν του υιου.*' Now when the figurative word DAY is used not to express in general the period of any one's existence, but to denote his peculiar office or employment, it must needs signify that very circumstance in his life, which is characteristic of such office and employment. But Jesus is here speaking of his peculiar office and employment, as appears from the occasion of the dispute: which was his saying that if any man keep my commandments, he shall never taste of death, intimating thereby the virtue of his office of Redeemer. Therefore by the word DAY, must needs be meant that characteristic circumstance of his life: but that circumstance was his laying it down for the redemption of mankind: consequently by the word DAY is meant the great sacrifice of Christ.' In answer to this, I must ask: Was there no circumstance characteristic of the *life* of Jesus, but his *death*? Did he not come as an instructor? which is implied in the very words cited by the Bishop for a contrary purpose; 'If any man keep my commandments'—He came not to save the world unconditionally, but in consequence

sequence of their admitting him as their teacher and example : so that his powers of instructing, and his virtuous conversation, were other circumstances characteristic of his life. Again, Was it not for our justification that he rose from the grave ? his resurrection, therefore, may as well be called his DAY, as his crucifixion. Nor are the Socinians so ignorant as to suppose, according to the Bishop's insinuation, that DAY means merely the life of Christ, or the period of his abode on earth, unconnected with his public ministry, his bringing men from the power of sin unto God.

The Bishop continues, ' But not only the matter, but the manner likewise of this great revelation, is delivered in the text—Abraham rejoiced to SEE my day, and he SAW it, and was glad. *ὡς ἰδὼς τὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν, καὶ ΕΙΔΕ.* This evidently shews it to have been made, not by relation in words, but by representation in action : the verb *εἶδεν* is frequently used in the New Testament in its proper signification, to *see sensibly* ; but whether literally or figuratively, it always denotes a full intuition.' If the Bishop means that the verb *εἶδεν* constantly and exclusively means to see literally with the corporeal eyes, in opposition to seeing metaphorically with the mind's eye, I believe he is mistaken. *ἰδὲ πόλιν ἀγαπῆν, 1 John iii. 1. εὗς ἀν' ἰδῶσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Luke ix. 27. μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ μήτις ἀνθρώπου εἶδεν. xvii. 22.* And if he mean only that it sometimes signifies literally to see, or as he somewhat oddly expresses it, to see sensibly, no one will contradict him, but only say that the remark is nothing to the purpose ; for, as I observed, it often means, to perceive *in any way* : but if it be contended, that the term

seeing

seeing must be understood literally; why should not that of *day* be taken so likewise: and why should we not say, that Abraham literally beheld, with his corporeal eyes, the literal day, the time of Christ's crucifixion?

‘ That the expression was as strong in the Syriac language used by Jesus, as here in the Greek of his historian, appears, saith the Bishop, from the reply the Jews made to him: ‘Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?’ plainly intimating, that they understood the assertion of Abraham’s seeing Christ’s day to be a real beholding him in person.’ But no argument of any kind can be drawn, I think, from the reply of the Jews, because they were ready, not to reason, but to catch at any cavil they could, to silence, or apparently triumph over our Lord. Christ, notwithstanding the answer of the Jews, never said that he had seen Abraham: all he affirmed, was, that Abraham, being endued with a very different temper from that of his posterity, rejoiced at what gave them pain. Now this could not be the death of Jesus, but his coming, his preaching, his claim of the Messiahship. Besides, the Bishop’s argument proves too much; for if the Jews understood that Abraham saw Christ in person, this was very different from seeing him in his type and representative Isaac.

A few pages after, the Bishop tells us that ‘Abraham rejoiced that he might see, *να ιδη*, which implies that the period of this joy was in the space between the promise that the favour should be conferred, and the actual conferring it, in the delivery of the command.’ But it may be observed,

VOL. VI.

F

that

that *ωα* is sometimes used by St. John as a particle denoting time, and may be rendered WHEN : as in the expression *ερχεται ωρα ωα*, chap. xii. 23. xvi. 2. 32. where the coming of the hour cannot be supposed the occasion of what was to happen. 'This is life eternal, that they may (or when they) know thee the only true God.' xvii. 3. 'This is God's work, i. e. then are ye doing it, when ye believe,' vi. 29. 'This is the love of God, i. e. then ye may be assured that we love him, when we keep his commandments, 1 John v. 3. *ηγαλλιασθη ωα ιδη* therefore may signify, he rejoiced to see, or when he saw. As to the word *αγαλλιασμαι*, that it denotes 'that tumultuous pleasure which the certain expectation of an approaching blessing, understood only in the gross, occasions ; and *χαρω* the calm and settled joy arising from the possession of it ;' it appears to be a criticism more refined than solid. See Matt. v. 12. where both words are used together : *χαυρετε & αγαλλιασθε*. John v. 35. Acts xvi. 34.

Would it not swell this digression to an immoderate length, I could enter upon an examination of what the Bishop advances in support of his strange hypothesis ; that the intended sacrifice of Isaac was an information by action of the sacrifice of Christ, and could give a striking instance of the versatility of human genius, when resolved at all events to draw a certain meaning, and establish a certain paradox, from a given passage of scripture, in direct opposition to its plain and only signification. I more readily, indeed, excuse myself this omission, as I perfectly agree with the worthy author of 'Memoirs of Dr. Sykes,' p. 269. N. 'that should the partial friendship of Bishop Hurd induce

induce him to be editor of the entire works of bishop Warburton, which is very credibly reported to be the case, it will be no impeachment of the judgment of the public, nor any loss to the cause of revelation, if the volumes are left to sleep in silence, in such general repositories, where his Lordship's generosity shall place them, even though they should be accompanied by a Dissertation on the Delicacy of Friendship.'

We have, then, no proper authority to declare from the sacred writings, that the oblation of Isaac, and the death of Christ are related as type and anti-type. Let us now examine, whether there is such a remarkable coincidence in their respective circumstances, as will easily overcome this fundamental difficulty.

The first thing that occurs in the history of the offering of Isaac, is an express declaration of the view with which the Almighty enjoined it—to try Abraham's faith. 'And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham,' ver. 1. and again at the conclusion, ver. 12. 'For now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.' If we must needs discover a resemblance between this part of the history, and any thing that occurs in the gospel, we know that God gave his only begotten son to die for mankind. Here, then, we have Abraham, the type of the Almighty, who to press the parallel close, may be supposed to command himself to resign his only begotten son, to tempt himself (I mention this, only for the use of those who firmly believe the doctrines of the Trinity and atonement in conjunction; and cannot

imagine it more difficult of digestion, than their avowed and established creed, 'that the Most Highest descended from heaven, and underwent the most humiliating and painful indignities, to appease his own wrath, endure the punishment they deserved, and procure from himself their pardon and forgiveness). Not that the thought is mine : we have it in Bishop Pearson (on the Creed, p. 199.) ' A clearer type can scarce be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed, than Isaac was : nor can God the Father, who gave his only begotten Son, be better expressed than by that patriarch, in his readiness to sacrifice his only son Isaac, whom he loved.' Archbishop Tillotson also tells us, Serm. lvi. vol. iv. p. 838. 8vo. 1742, ' What God required of Abraham, he did not intend should be executed : but one great design of it was to be a type and figure of that immense love and kindness, which he intended to all mankind, in the sacrifice of his son, as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.' And Bishop Warburton's opinion is, that ' Abraham desired earnestly to be let into the mystery of the redemption ; and God, to instruct him (in the best manner humanity is capable of receiving instruction) in the infinite extent of his goodness to mankind, *let Abraham feel by experience what it was to lose a beloved son.*' Surely these eminent men did not consider the consequences to which their veneration for received opinions led them : and why need they have been studious to forge similitudes, and imagine analogies unwarranted and unobserved by the sacred writers ? But on the other hand, shall we find any resemblance

blance between the real design of the death of Christ, and the oblation of Isaac? Was it ever pretended that Isaac had been a prophet, who was to give the last proof of *his own* sincerity, and obedience to the will of God, by submitting to be sacrificed? Was he commanded to be slain, that he might make millions happy, and be raised from the dead, as an earnest of a general resurrection? A thousand questions of this kind might be asked: and except the correspondence between the two characters appeared much more exact than it does at present, we should have little reason to conclude that the one was typified by the other*.

We may in the next place observe, that as this intended sacrifice was to be the test of Abraham's piety, so he is the object of God's reward. Whereas, if this fact were prefigurative of what happened to Jesus; as Isaac, like him was the sufferer, Isaac also, like him, should be the person recompensed. But to Abraham the Almighty declares, 'because thou hast not withheld thy son—In blessing I will bless thee. And afterwards, when Isaac is blessed (xxvi. 3—5) the reason is not because he had been offered up, or merited any thing personally, but because Abraham had obeyed God's voice.

* I lately met with a curious specimen of this kind, which I cannot withhold from the reader. 'Is not the universal deluge typified by the cruelty of Cronus, towards his own father Ouranus, by *αιδοια αποσινδεντε*, so that he bled till quite exhausted? For explaining Ouranus by what the Latins call *cœlum*, it will very well signify, that there was a time when the heavens were rent, as it were, and the rain descended in torrents, till its stores were quite exhausted,' *Monthly Review*, for October, 1784, p. 282.

Let us read God's command to the patriarch : ' Take now thy son, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.' The place where this sacrifice was to be performed, must have been, in the opinion of the learned, either on mount Moriah, on which Solomon's temple stood, or on Calvary, where Jesus suffered. Archbishop Tillotson thus expresses himself (Sermons iv. 839) ' And as St. Hierom tells us from an ancient and constant tradition of the Jews, the mountain in Moriah, where Abraham was commanded to sacrifice, was mount Calvary, where also our Lord was crucified and offered up.' The learned authors of the Universal History say (Ancient Pt. ii. 408) ' It is commonly thought that it was on this mount (Moriah on which Solomon's temple stood) that Abraham was commanded to sacrifice his son Isaac : though that notion is not without some difficulties, which we may have occasion to mention in the sequel.' Notwithstanding which they expressly affirm (iii. 265. N.) ' This mountain, on which Abraham was ordered to sacrifice, is certainly the same on which the temple was afterwards built by Solomon ;' and refers to 2 Chron. iii. 1. ' Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem on mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared unto David his Father.' In like manner Dr. Wells (Geography i. 332.) But it is evident from the text, that the term Moriah was the name, not of any particular mountain, but of a hill-country in general. מריח from ראח to be seen, or conspicuous, is translated ענין רוא by Aquila and the LXX, and *terram visonis* by the vulgate ;

vulgate ; which version is authorised, ver. 4, where it is said that Abraham lift up his eyes, and saw the place afar off.' The destined hill was called Jehovah-jireh ; a name it would hardly have lost, when imposed in consequence of so memorable a transaction. It is almost impossible to imagine, that this title should never have been mentioned upon the building the temple, especially when the incident of God's appearing to David upon it is recorded ; and still more inconceivable is it that it should never be mentioned, when Isaac's supposed antitype was slain upon it. Have we sufficient authority to assert, that that part of mount Moriah which was called Calvary, was ever denominated Jehovah-jireh ? What credit is due to a Jewish tradition, and especially when it is recorded by Jerom, I leave the reader to determine. Not that this point is by any means material in our present enquiry ; for granting that Abraham's altar was built on the very spot on which Christ suffered, the circumstance would no more prove that the oblation of Isaac was figurative of Christ's crucifixion than of that of the two thieves. The reason a sober expositor would assign for our Lord's being put to death on Calvary, is not because Isaac was offered there ; but because it was the usual place in which malefactors submitted to their sentence. Should it, on the other hand, be maintained, that Abraham was ordered to this spot, because the Almighty had pre-determined it for Christ's crucifixion, we may on equal authority assert, that God appointed it to the patriarch, because the two thieves were to suffer there. Conjecture is worth as much on one side as the other.

Isaac was to be offered as a *burnt* offering : Will any one pretend that our Lord's crucifixion is to be called by that name ? It can indeed be stiled a sacrifice only metaphorically, as Dr. Priestley has ably shewn (*Corrupt. Christianity*, vol. 1. pt. 2. sect. 3. Ben Mordecai's *Apol.* 8vo. ii. 821.) Defenders of established opinions are not anxious to distinguish between an altar and a cross ; between what was accursed, and what was clean ; and rejoice to find, in conformity with other mysteries, the three persons of priest, of victim, and of offerer, united in one substance.

The learned Ben Mordecai tells us, ii. 802, ' that the sacrifice of Isaac appears to be the nearest of any to the sacrifice of Christ ; being both of them acts of obedience to God, and undertaken by his command.' But surely the learned author here confounds the ideas of a literal sacrifice, as that of Isaac would have been, if completed ; and a metaphorical one, as was that of Christ, according to his own acknowledgment, p. 821. ' In neither case (says he) was there any sign of eating and drinking at God's table ; for neither God nor man could be supposed to partake of such a sacrifice.' But he must excuse me if I imagine, that in a holocaust, as the sacrifice of Isaac was intended to be, the fire, i. e. the symbol of the god, was supposed to eat the flesh and drink the blood *. See Sykes on Sacrifices, p. 74. 131. Pl. l. 13. Again, saith B. Mordecai, p. 817, the effect of both sacrifices was of the same nature ; for as Abraham by this

* The difficulty of conceiving how God should eat this sacrifice, is obviated by his having commanded it to be offered.

act of obedience gained great blessings for his own family ; so hath Jesus Christ, by a life and death of obedience, gained the power of bestowing blessings upon all the families of the earth.* I acknowledge that God is said (anthropomorphitically) to remember the oath that he swore unto Abraham, &c. as if his mercy to the Israelites was to proceed out of respect for the patriarch : but I deny that such a representation is ever made in regard to Christ. The reward our Lord is said to have obtained is merely personal : he was recompensed with being *preferred to others*, for the enjoyment of his exalted ministry, of bringing God's predetermined blessings to pass. He is in no sense whatever said to procure, purchase, or obtain salvation, or the power of forgiving *from God* for us : nor is the redemption ever described as taking place for his sake, *δια χριστον**, *μετα χριστου*. The Almighty is said to dispense his favours by means of our Lord*, *δια χριστου εν χριστω*, by his instrumentality ; but never at his instance or request (Mord. 660.) Nor is such phraseology † ever used concerning Christ, as is applied with respect to Abimelech and the friends of Job : *προσευξεται περι ου*. Gen. xx. 7. — Job xlii. 8. *ευξεται περι υμων*. On the contrary, our Lord tells us, ' I say not that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you, John xvi. 26.' a text which I cannot but think

* The rule of grammarians is, that when *δια* is used with an accusative case, it implies the *cause* ; when with a genitive it signifies the instrument, or means by which a thing is done.' Sykes on Hebrews, ii. 10.

† Mordecai, ii. 655.

decisive

decisive against any literal and actual intercession. See Theol. Rep. iv. 345.

But to return : We come now to the passage on which the learned lay the greatest stress, to prove that Isaac was the type of Christ. ‘ And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son.’ Thus Dr. Barrow (Works ii. 279.) ‘ Isaac, the immediate heir of the promise, in whom the faithful seed was called, and conveyed down, and so a most apt type of our Saviour being devoted and offered up unto God, did himself bear the wood on which he was to be offered ; so did our Saviour, the promised seed, in whom all nations should be blessed, himself bear the cross by which he was to suffer, and to be offered up a sacrifice to God.’ So likewise Bishop Pearson, Creed 200. ‘ Now when that grand act of obedience was to be performed, we find Isaac walking to the mountain of Moriah, with the wood on his shoulder, and saying, here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice ? While in the command of God, and the intention and resolution of Abraham, Isaac is the sacrifice that bears the wood : and the Christ who was to be the most perfect sacrifice, the person in whom all nations were perfectly to be blessed, could die no other death, in which the wood was to be carried : and being to die upon the cross, was by the formal custom used in that kind of death, certainly to carry it. *Therefore* Isaac bearing the wood did signify Christ bearing the cross.’ But it should be considered, that the real reason of Isaac’s carrying the wood, was because his father, *jam senior*,
was

was sufficiently employed, in bearing the fire and the knife; and did not choose that any of his young men should attend him to the place of worship. 'Abide ye here, &c. This at least is all that can be gathered from the history. Whereas, if the mere action of bearing the wood were sufficient to constitute Isaac a type of Jesus, he might for the same reason be pronounced a type of all the malefactors that ever were crucified. Besides, if we attend to Matt. xxvii. 32. Mark xv. 21. Luke xxiii. 26. we shall not observe that Jesus is recorded to have borne his cross at all; for they tell us that one Simon a Cyrenian was laid hold of, and compelled to bear it after him; and the only way by which we can reconcile these accounts to that of John xix. 17. is that Jesus carried it out of the Prætorium, where the assembly was held, and upon his coming forth was relieved of his burden, being too much exhausted to support it any farther, when Simon was pressed into the service, and forced to bear it to Calvary. St. John's words are βασιλῶν τον σταυρον ἐξηλθεν εις τον λεγομενον Κρανι τοπον, he bearing his cross, went out (of the judgment-hall) towards Golgotha. The expression is by no means so strong as if it had been written, 'He bore his cross to Golgotha.' Nor does it in any degree militate with the deposition of the other evangelists, who tell us that thus far he was relieved.

When they came to the place appointed, we find Isaac entirely ignorant of his father's intention, and asking, Where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? Is he in this point a type of him, who foresaw the cruelties that awaited him, and was by
no

no means betrayed into the sufferings he underwent?

I have already observed a manifest difference suggested to us (ver. 9.) that Abraham built an altar, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar on the wood.' Where was the altar in the case of Jesus? The manner of their death, had both of them been killed, would have been quite different: the one as a sacrifice and burnt-offering, the other as a criminal.

But the most revolting part of the history is yet behind; for 'when Abraham stretched forth his hand to slay his son, the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven, and said, 'Lay not thine hand upon the lad.' This is a very different catastrophe from that which attended Jesus. Shall we say that Isaac's escape was typical of Christ's death? or that the intended sacrifice of the former prefigured the real execution of the latter?

But behold a ram caught in a thicket by his horns, which Abraham went and took, and offered for a burnt-offering instead of his son! Why may we not call this ram, as well as those we read of in Leviticus, a type of Christ! or at least say with Bishop Warburton, that 'not only the *final anti-typical* sacrifice of the Son of God was figured in the *commanded* one of Isaac; but the *intermediate typical* sacrifice in the mōsaic œconomy was represented by the *permitted* sacrifice of the ram offered up instead of Isaac.' One thing I would suggest to the lovers of this mystical theology, which is, that the ram is said expressly to be a vicarious sufferer; and this may furnish as good a proof

proof as they will find of their favourite doctrine concerning the vicarious sufferings of Christ. I have anticipated what I had to say upon the circumstance of the reward being promised, not to Isaac, but to Abraham.

Ver. 14. And Abraham called the name of that place, Jehovah-jireh, as it is said to this day, not 'in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen,' but, as people at this day, when any thing happens in that place, say, 'It came to pass in Jehovah-jireh.' This title is supposed to refer to what is said (verse 8) 'the Lord will see, or provide.' So it may. I will, however, take the liberty of suggesting, that it may possibly refer, though the words are not the same, to what is said, ver. 2. Offer him upon one of the mountains which *I will tell thee of*. Thus Jehovah-jireh may signify 'The Lord hath shewed, i. e. the mountain [as in this verse יֵאָמֵר the future tense is rendered by the present.] The verb in Hiph. occurs in this sense, Deut. xxxiv. 1. "And the Lord shewed him, יֵרְאֵהוּ, all the land.' Ver. 14. therefore may be rendered, And Abraham called the name of that place, Jehovah-jireh; as it is said at this day, 'In the mount the Lord shewed.'

I hope I have satisfactorily proved what I proposed; first, that we have no authority to assert, that the intended sacrifice of Isaac was typical of our Lord's crucifixion; and secondly, that there is no coincidence observable in the facts themselves, sufficient to justify such a position. It appears, indeed, to me, that we can
scarce

scarce find any two events more compleatly dissimilar in every respect. And did even the two or three circumstances on which so much stress is laid, namely, bearing the wood, and being offered as a sacrifice, most perfectly correspond in themselves, and in the views with which they were brought to pass, even this would be no proper ground to maintain that one event was prefigurative of the other. We must not allow ourselves to pick and cull here and there a single circumstance, as it suits our convenience; and neglect what we cannot bend to our purpose; the similarity must be general: otherwise we shall argue no better than if we looked into universal history for events that happen alike to all kingdoms and empires, and afterwards regard them as divine predictions of what should befall any particular state..

EREUNETES.

A new

*A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv. with Notes,
critical and explanatory.*

1. **M**OREOVER, brethren, I advertise you
of the glad tidings which I preached
unto you ; which also ye accepted from *me* ;
2. in which, too, ye have continued ; through
which also ye are saved, if ye maintain the
word as I preached it unto you : if not,
ye believed in vain.
3. For I delivered unto you, as the principal
thing, such as I also received *it*, that
Christ died for our sins, according to the
4. scriptures : and that he was buried, and
that he was raised up on the third day, ac-
5. cording to the scriptures : and that he
6. was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve.
Afterwards he was seen by above five
hundred brethren at once ; of whom a
good many continue until now, though
7. some, indeed, are fallen asleep. After-
8. wards he was seen by James, then by all
the apostles. Last of all, he was seen by
9. me also, *who am but* as an abortion. For
I am the least of the apostles ; one not
worthy to be called an apostle, because I
persecuted

80 *A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv.*

10. persecuted the church of God. But by the favour of God I am such as I am; and this his favour towards me became not vain; for I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the favour of God;
11. which was with me. Whether, however, *it were* I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed.
12. But, if Christ be preached, as being raised from among the dead, why do some amongst you say, that there is no resurrection of the dead?
13. Now, if there be no resurrection of the
14. dead, neither was Christ raised: and if Christ was not raised, then *is* this our preaching
15. vain, and this your faith also vain. We are convicted also of false testimony concerning God: for we testified of God, that he raised the Messiah; whom he raised not,
16. if therefore the dead are not raised: for, if the dead are not raised, neither was Christ
17. raised; and if Christ was not raised, your
18. faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins: for this reason they, also, who are fallen asleep
19. in Christ, are lost. Since in this life only our hope is in Christ, we are the most miserable of all men.
20. But now Christ was raised from among the dead; a first-fruits of *them* who were
21. fallen asleep. For since through man *was* death, so through man *was* a resurrection of
22. the dead: for as in Adam all die, so also in
23. Christ will all be made alive. But each in his

- his proper order: Christ a first-fruits; afterwards *they* who are Christ's, at his coming. Then *will* the end *be*: when he hath delivered the kingdom to God and the Father; when he hath abolished all government, and all authority, and power.
24. For he must reign until God hath put all the
25. enemies under his feet. The last enemy
26. *that* is destroyed, is death. For he hath
27. put all things under his feet: but when it
- faith, that all things have been put under, it is manifest, that he is excepted, who put
28. all things under him. But, when all things shall be put under him, then will the son himself also be subjected to *him*, who put all things under him; that God may be all in all.
29. Else, what will become of *those*, who are baptised with respect to the dead, if the
30. dead are by no means raised? Why, indeed, are they baptised with respect to the
30. dead? and why do we also endanger our-
31. selves every hour? *I protest* by *my* boasting of you, which I have in Christ Jesus
32. our Lord, I die daily. If, to speak as a man, I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what is my advantage *from it*, if the dead are not raised? Let us eat and drink; for to-
33. morrow we die. Deceive not yourselves: evil communications corrupt good man-
34. ners. Be sober with righteousness, and sin not: for some have an ignorance of God. I say *this* to you as a reproof,

82 *A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv.*

35. But some one will say : " Why are the dead
 raised ?" And, " With what body do they
 36. " come ?" Thou senseless man ! what thou
 sowest, is not made alive, unless it become
 37. dead. And what thou sowest, thou sowest
 not that body, which it will be, but a bare
 grain ; of wheat, perhaps, or of some other
 38. grain. But God giveth it a body as he
 pleased ; and to each of the seeds its own
 39. body. The same flesh is not the flesh of all
animals : but there is one flesh of men, and
 another flesh of beasts, and another of fishes,
 40. and another of birds. *There are* also celest-
 tial bodies, and bodies terrestrial : but the
 glory of the celestial is one, and that of the
 41. terrestrial, another. *There is* one glory of
 the sun, and another glory of the moon, and
 another glory of the stars : and even one
 42. star excelleth another star in glory. So al-
 so the resurrection of the dead. It is sown
 in corruption ; it is raised in incorruption :
 43. it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory :
 44. it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power ;
 it is sown an animal body, it is raised a spi-
 ritual body. It is an animal body, and it is
 45. a spiritual body. So also it is written :
 " The first man Adam became a living
 " soul : " the last Adam, a spirit, that giveth
 46. life. But the spiritual was not first, but
 47. the animal ; afterwards the spiritual. The
 first man, *formed* of the earth, was but dust :
 the second man *is* the Lord from heaven.
 48. Like him, who was *formed* of the dust, are
 they

- they also, who are *formed* of the *same* dust ;
and like the heavenly, *will* the heavenly
49. also *be*. And as we bore the image of the
man formed of the dust ; we shall also bear
50. the image of the heavenly *man*. Now this
I say, brethren, because flesh and blood
cannot inherit a kingdom of God ; nor
doth corruption inherit incorruption,
51. Behold ! I tell you a mystery ; we shall
52. not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in
a moment, in a twinkling of an eye, at the
last trumpet (for it will sound) and the dead
will be raised incorruptible, and we shall be
53. changed. For this corruptible must clothe
itself with incorruption, and this mortal must
54. clothe itself with immortality. And, when
this corruptible shall clothe itself with in-
corruption, and this mortal shall clothe it-
self with immortality ; then will come to
pass the saying which is written : “ Death
55. “ was swallowed up in victory.” O ! death,
where is thy sting ? O ! grave, where is
56. thy victory ? The sting indeed of death is
57. sin ; and the power of sin is the law. But
thanks *be* to God, who giveth us the vic-
tory through our Lord Jesus Christ.
58. Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be
stedfast, immovable, always abounding in
the work of the Lord ; knowing, that this
your Labour will not be vain in the Lord.

Analysis of the chapter.

The apostle, in the introduction, reminds his
Corinthian converts of the gospel, which he had
G 2 preached

84 *A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv.*

preached amongst them, and mentions its great importance: ver. 1—3.

The principal topic of his preaching was *the resurrection of Christ*; the evidences of which are briefly recited: ver. 3—12.

He argues that *Christ's resurrection*, is the only *mean* and *security* of the future resurrection of mankind: v. 12—20.

He then takes this proposition for granted, and relates some particulars concerning the final consummation of things: ver. 20—29.

He represents the folly of suffering in the cause of *christianity* upon the supposition of no *resurrection*; v. 29—35.

He proposes and answers *two* objections: one, relating to the *propriety* and *use* of *death*; the other to the *future bodies* of the righteous: ver. 35—51,

He unfolds some particulars of the resurrection, and concludes with an earnest exhortation to perseverance: ver. 51 to the end,

N O T E S,

V. 2. *ἐὰν οὐκ ἔσται με*—*if not*—"If ye do not continue steadfast in the gospel, your former belief is vain." This is the import of the words: and so the *Syriac* and *Arabic* translators properly distribute them.

V. 3. *ἐν πρώτοις*—as the *capital* doctrine of the gospel, So—*IN PRIMIS fertur*, i. e. —*ἐν πρώτοις φερεται*—Ter. Eun iii. 1. *Inter præcipua*, says GROTIUS very justly, *quæ credere debebatis*.

V. 4. *All* these particulars—*Christ's death*—for our *sins*—his *burial*—his *resurrection*—and on the

the *third day*—are not found in the *propheticals*, but the *evangelical* scriptures. It is, therefore, as if he had said: “I communicated to you what I received, and what ye have read in the narratives of the *gospel*.”

V. 5. The *Vulgate* and some MSS. have—*τοὺς ἐνδεκα* a purposed alteration from an unnecessary scruple on account of the death of *Judas*: *Οὗ δώδεκα* seems to have become a *general* denomination, without respect to its original derivation.

V. 6. *οἱ πολλοί*—as we say, *a good many*: מְרֹבֵּה אֱלֹדִין מְנַחֵם—Syr. and so the *Vulg.* *multi*: אֱלֹדִין מְנַחֵם—*eorum nonnulli*: Arab. and so Eth. *וכ אלה*—*sunt qui*: which hardly comes up to the meaning of the apostle.

Every body must observe what an air of sincerity this appeal to *living witnesses* carries with it.

V. 9. *κατασκευα* has only the power of *ειναι* here and in many other places of the New Testament.

V. 10. *ἐίμι ο ἐίμι*—*I am such as I am*: i. e. a man of *some* consequence; which, however, I owe entirely to God.

In the last clause Syr. & Æth. read *η χάρις αὐτοῦ*.

V. 11. The *Æthiopic* version and some MSS. read *ἐπισυνέταμεν*: which quite subverts the argument of the apostle, who is appealing to *their* former acceptance (ver. 1.) of christianity and the doctrine of a resurrection in particular.

V. 12. It should seem from this verse, that some of the primitive professors of the gospel

86 *A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv.*

were not sufficiently aware of the great importance of Christ's resurrection; when it is indeed the very corner-stone of our faith. Νεκρῶν—more exactly—*dead men*: without the article.

V. 13. *Neither was Christ raised*: because the resurrection of Christ was of no possible use and significance, but as an earnest of the resurrection of mankind.

V. 14. The *Arabic* reads η τῶν ἡμῶν and the *Æthiopic* has בת תאמן—η τῶν ἐν αἰῶν.

V. 15. εὐρισκομεθα—i. e.—εσμεν.

κατα τα Θεα—i. e.—περι τα Θεα see κατα, so used, for *concerning*, or *with respect to*, in *Aristot. Rhet.* p. 33. *Ed. Ox. Soph. Æd. Tyr.* 236. Accordingly, the *Syriac* has ܠܝ, the *Arabic* ١٧, and the *Æthiopic* 𐌵𐌶. We reject, therefore, the criticism of *Grotius* as too subtle: *CONTRA Deum enim est testimonium omne, quod Deum fecisse dicit id quod non fecit.*

The *Syriac* omits the last clause, and runs thus: *For we testified of God, that he raised the Messiah, when he did not raise him.*

V. 16. *For if, &c.* an effect must have a cause: and the resurrection of Christ is holden forth as the occasion of our resurrection.

From ver. 15—18, the reasoning before advanced from ver. 12—15, is repeated and earnestly pressed on their attention.

V. 17. ὃ ἐτι: *Syr. Arab. Æth.* ἐτι γαρ: *Vulg.*

V. 18. οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ—i. e.—the *christians*, who are *dead*, relying on the imaginary event of their Lord's resurrection. The same as οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ: 1 *Thess.* iv. 16. or τὰς κοιμηθείσας διὰ τὴν ἰησοῦ. in ver.

A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv. 87

ver. 14: of that chapter, if the words are pointed as in the editions: but *δια τῆς Ἰησους* is better joined with the subsequent clause—*αἰεὶ συν αὐτῷ*.

ἀπωλόητο—*ἀ·ε·* lost—are perished and gone for ever, without any prospect of revival. The following epigram is an excellent illustration of the passage:

Ἡ ῥ' ὑπο σοὶ χαρίδας ἀναπαύεται; Εἰ τῶν Ἀρμενικῶν

Τὰ κυρητὰς παύδα λεγεις, ὑπ' ἐμοί.

Ὡ χαρίδα, τί τα νεύθεις; Ποῦ σκόλοῦ. Αἱ δ' ἀνόδοι τί;

Ψευδοῦ. Οὐδὲ Πάσιον; Μυδοῦ ἀπωλομεθα.

V. 19. This verse will admit *two* acceptations. The *first*, and the most agreeable to the arrangement of the words, is this:

“If in this life we have hoped in Christ only,” and have had no other hope (as in God, suppose) “we are, &c.”

But then this would imply, that a resurrection might be expected independent of Christ, which the apostle supposes to be incompatible. Therefore the other meaning, followed in our translation, is the better:

“If our hopes in Christ do not extend beyond “this life, we christians, and especially we “preachers of the gospel, who suffer so much, “are the most wretched of mankind: we are “more distressed without any better expectations.”

Ελεεινότεροι. πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις—literally—*more worthy of pity than all other men.* *Ελεεινότεροι* for *ελεεινότεροι* as Lycurg. cont. Leo. 8. *πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις βαθυμυδίοι* εἴσθε. In this case no ambiguity is caused by the

G 4

substitution,

88 *A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv.*

substitution, as there would be in some. In the following; for instance:

Ο ΜΗ ΠΕΠΛΕΥΜΩΣ ΕΔΕΝ ΕΩΡΑΚΕΝ ΚΑΚΟΥ.

Των μόνον μαχητῶν ἔσμεν ἀθλιώτεροι. Pofidip. apud Athen.

The *Syriac*, *Coptic*, and *Vulgate* very properly connect the words like our common version.

V. 20. ΝΥΝ ΔΕ—*but now*. The apostle employs this phrase at the close of an argument, to enforce a conclusion: so Rom. iii. 21. As if he had said: “But why all this solicitude—why all this argument to establish a fact so abundantly authenticated by ocular testimony—so well known to many now alive? Christ is *actually* “risen, &c.”

ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ—*from among the dead: from the dead* is not sense, either in *Greek* or *English*: and the *Greek* phrase itself is sufficiently singular. The *Coptic* has very significantly—εβόλχεν νεθμωστ—*ab-inter mortuos*. See ver. 12.

ΤΩΝ ΚΕΚΟΙΜΗΜΕΝΩΝ—*them, who are fallen asleep*. The word in the *present tense*, joined with ὑπν, is sometimes taken *actively*, as:

ΤΗΔΕ ΣΑΩΝ Ο ΔΙΚΩΝ ΑΚΑΝΘΙ ΙΕΡΟΙ ΥΠΝΟΥ
ΚΟΙΜΑΙ· ΘΝΗΣΚΕΙΝ ΜΗ ΛΕΓΕ ΤΗΣ ΑΓΑΘΗΣ.

The construction of this verse is ungrammatical. Either η should be inserted before ἀπαρχη, as in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* versions; or, which is better, ἐγενετο should be omitted, as in the *Coptic*, *Vulgate*, and some MSS..

V. 21. This verse is not, as is generally supposed, precisely similar to the *twenty-second*. A
1 *reason*

A new Translation of 1 Cor. xv. 89

reason is assigned in the first, and a fact stated in latter. "Since by man was death, by man also (as a fit and proper disposition of things, Heb. ii. 14—16.) was the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam, &c.

Conformable to this is the observation of Eusebius: Επειδή δι' ἀνθρώπου θανάτου εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, χρεὴν ἦν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὴν κατὰ τὸ θάνατον βραβεύεσθαι νίκην. καὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ θανάτου σῶμα ζωῆς ἀναδειχθῆναι. Dem. Ev. vii. 1 and 2.

The Syriac and Æthiopic have *εγενετο* in both clauses of this verse; the Arabic and Coptic in the former only.

V. 23. *εκαστος*—each—not—every one: for two parties only are spoken of: Christ on one side, and mankind on the other: and so the apostle immediately explains himself. Yet the righteous part of mankind only is meant—οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ—they, who belong to Christ, for their resurrection, seems to be exclusively treated of in this chapter.

The Vulgate deviates from the original: *Deinde ii, qui sunt Christi, qui in adventu ejus crediderunt*: οἱ εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευσαν—as it is in some MSS.

V. 24. τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ—I suppose αὐτοῦ is understood—his God and father: see 2 Cor. i. 3. &c. The Syriac well reads: τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ—לאלהים אב.

καταργησι—i. e.—Θεοῦ: by the universal diffusion, I presume, and establishment of christianity—by the abolition of all false and idol-worship. So Antichrist will be destroyed by the breath of his mouth, and the brightness of his coming—by the clear irresistible evidences of the gospel, prevailing through the earth: 2 Tess. ii. 8. If. xi. 4.

V. 25.

V. 25. *θη*—i. e.—*Θεοῦ*,

V. 26. Or render: *Death, the last enemy, will be destroyed*: for the *present* is here used for the *future*, as frequently in this chapter: so Vulg. *destruetur*. Copt. Arab. & Æth.

V. 27, This verse will admit *two* interpretations:

Either—"Death will be at last destroyed, who
"has subdued all things, except God:" who is
therefore stiled *ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀπ᾿ ἁπλῶς*—1 Tim. i. 17.—
ὁ μὲν *ἐχὼν ἀνάκτασιν*—vi. 16, &c.

Or—"Death itself will be at last destroyed, be-
"cause every thing will be subject to Christ, ex-
"cept God, who made every thing subject to
"him."

The latter appears to be the true sense (though
the restriction seems in this case to be so very auk-
ward and unnecessary) because God alone in this
passage is spoken of as *πάντα υποτάσσων*.

The former interpretation would suit all the ver-
sions, except the *Æthiopic*.

The great awkwardness of the restriction above-
mentioned has induced some critics to look out
for another meaning of *ἐν*: and so understand
the apostle as affirming this subjection to be *ex-
clusive* and *independent* of their original and perpe-
tual subjection to God: but the instances collected
to justify this sense in the *Theological Repository*,
vol. iii. p. 256. are mistaken.

εἰπὼν—i. e.—*τὴν γράφην*—as several times in Heb. i.

In this verse the apostle recurs to his assertion in
ver. 25, interrupted by the mention of death.
"But, when I said above, that all things will be
"subject to Christ, I meant to exclude God from
"this subjection."

V. 29.

V. 29. ΕΠΕΙ—*else—otherwise*: so *Lucian*; Αποδιδω-
νίας. ΕΠΕΙ ΚΑΛΑΔΥΣΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΣΚΑΦΟΣ.

ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ—*with respect to the dead*: i. e. with
reference to a resurrection of the dead. The plain
meaning of this much debated passage seems to be
this:

“What will become of those, who are admitted
“by baptism into the profession of christianity, as
“a religion, which promises immortality to its
“votaries: and indeed, what is the use and signi-
“ficancy of baptism itself, if there be no resur-
“rection?”

Perfectly consonant to this interpretation are the
expressions of the apostle in other places: see par-
ticularly Rom. vi. 3—6. Col. ii. 12—14.

The *Æthiopic* translation of this verse is worth
quoting: *For what reason do they baptise, but that
they may revive from death? And, if they will not
revive from death, why do they baptise?*

V. 31. ἢ ΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ ΚΑΥΧΗΣΘΙ—this species of asse-
veration serves principally to shew, how much he
gloried in them as his converts: compare 2 Cor.
i. 14. Phil. ii. 16. iv. 1. 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20. It
is in the true spirit of the ancients. A person in-
Suidas complains, that men *κτλ* των αὐτῶν συμφορῶν ὀμνύουσιν
because they were *great and uncommon*. To this
purpose is the protestation of *Telemachus* in Hom.
Od. X. 339.

Ὁυ μὰ Ζην, Ἀγέλας, καὶ ἀλγέα πάρος ἐμοῖο.
where see *Clarke's* note.

So Ov. Ep. Ariad. ad Thef. ver. 73.
*Cum mihi dicebas, PER ego ipsa PERICULA juro,
Te fore, dum nostrum vivet uterque, meum.*

After

After *καυχῶμαι*, Syr. Vulg. and some MSS. read *ἀδελφοί* · and Æth. & Copt. *ἀδελφοί μου*.

V. 32. *καὶ ἀνθρώπων*—*to speak as a man—humanly speaking*. I am satisfied, that this is the true, as it is the obvious, meaning of this controverted phrase. *καὶ ἀνθρώπων* is a common expression in Greek authors for the *size, manners, &c.* of men in general. See 1 Cor. ix. 8. 2 Cor. xi. 21, &c. He uses the terms to qualify the word *ἐθνηριομαχῆσα*.

I have sometimes thought that we should read *ανθρώπων* in connexion with *ἐθνηριομαχῆσα* · but in the SS. when so many versions and MSS. are harmonious, there is but little room for conjecture, or this might be admitted.

The Syriac countenances my interpretation: *דבית אן אד בנישא*: *If, as far as one contending amongst men, can be said to have done so, I fought with beasts*.

The Coptic has: *κεν θυμειρωμι*—literally—in *humanitate*—i. e. I suppose, *inter homines*.

The advice of the apostle, upon the supposition of no resurrection, is entirely rational, and consonant to the general sentiments of mankind. *Si post mortem*, says an elegant writer, *nihil sumus, profecto stultissimi est hominis non huic vitæ consulere, ut sit quam diutina et commodis omnibus plena*. Lactant. v. 18.

Οὐ γὰρ βανύμεθ' ἐν πνεύματι ἐγγέλων φαντασίᾳ,

Οὐδ' ἐν νεκροῖς πάλτεται γαμινῶ, Athen. Deip. vii. 6. vid. apud eund. xii. 7. the *epitaph* of *Sardanapalus*.

V. 33. To the same purpose are those verses in *Demosthenes*.

Oris

Οτις δ' ὁμιλων ἠδελαι κακοις ααηρ,
 Ου πωποτ' ηρωησα, γιγνωσκων οη
 Τοιςδ' εστιν οησ περ ἠδελαι ξυνων.

V. 34. *εαυτῶν δικαιοῦς*—*be sober with righteousness*: a singular mode of expression, for—*εαυτῶν και ετε δικαιοῦς*. *εαυτῶν* refers to the *Epicurean* maxim *φρονιμον*, &c. ver. 32. and *δικαιοῦς* to the subject of the *Iambic* in ver. 33.

The scripture sense of *αγγωσια*, and the other words of the same derivation, is rather *heedlessness*, or *inattention*, than *want of knowledge*.

V. 35. *πως*—*why*—as in ver. 12, &c. See *Aristoph. Plut.* 574.

It has been well observed, that *two* distinct objections are advanced in this verse; to which *two* distinct answers are returned by the apostle.

The *first* question is levelled at the *use* of a resurrection; when it seems much *more easy* and natural for life to be *continued* without the intervention of death, than to cease only to be restored; and the body to decay, only to be formed anew. The answer to this question is contained in ver. 36.

The *second* objection is raised from the *body*, that will be given us at the resurrection, when our former *body* is destroyed. This is refuted from ver. 37—51.

V. 36. *εαν μη αποθανῃ*—*except it die*. This argument from analogy had been before advanced by our Saviour, John xii. 24. *semina non, nisi corrupta, revirescent*. Mic. Fel. 34. And yet this argument proceeds, I should suppose, upon the popular opinion of those days; for it is not likely, nor can it easily be thought, nor is it suitable to the observation of those conversant in such matters,

ters, that the vital principal of a grain, which shoots up, *ever* dies previous to its revival. Nor indeed does it appear in the case of mankind, that death is absolutely necessary: witness the translations of *Enoch* and *Elijah*. What then? Is the objection of our apostle's antagonist unanswerable? By no means: it is sufficiently refuted by repeating the apostle's answer to the second difficulty. God hath appointed AS IT PLEASED HIM. ver. 38.

V. 37. τῶν λοιπῶν σπερμάτων—Syr. Copt. Arab.

V. 38. τοῖδ' οὖν σῶμα—its own—specific—discriminating *body*. A beautiful passage of *Lucretius* is very pertinent to this occasion, and will illustrate the observations of the apostle.

*Postremo, quodvis frumentum: non tamen omne
Quodque, seu in genere inter se simile esse videbis,
Quin intercurrat quædam distantia formis
Cunctarumque genus parili ratione videmus
Pingere telluris gremium, qua mollibus undis
Littoris incurvi tibulum pavit æquor arenam
Quare etiam atque etiam simili ratione necesse est,
Natura quoniam constant, neque facta manu sunt
Unius ad certam formam primordia rerum,
Dissimili inter se quædam volitare figura. Lib. ii.*

V. 41. διαφέρει—*excellerth*, rather than *differerth*, because of the gradation—*Sun--Moon--and Stars*. So all the versions, but the Vulgate.

If *ἀστρον* could be supposed to mean in the same connection a *star* properly so called, and a *heavenly body* in general, this passage would admit another, and a very good interpretation, thus:

There

There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars : for one heavenly body excelleth another heavenly body in glory : and so too is the resurrection of the dead.

In either case, these last comparisons not only serve to illustrate the differences of bodies, but the different glories of the present and future state.

V. 42. The construction of this passage is not very clear ; for σπέρμα is the nominative to σπυρίαν· *the seed is sown*, i. e. *man's condition is here perishable, hereafter incorruptible, &c.*

The Syriac gives it in the plural number : *they are sown*—and so on : מדרען—i. e. οἱ νεκροί.

V. 44. Or thus : *an animal body is sown, a spiritual body is raised.*

It is worthy of observation, that the *soul*, as we speak, is not mentioned without the *body*. Even in *heaven*, we are to be furnished with a *body*.

Sic ANIMUS PER SE NON QUI SINE CORPORE, et IPSE ESSE HOMINE ; illius quasi quod vos esse videtur, Sive aliud quidvis potis es conjunctias eu Fingere : quandoquidem connexus corpori adhæret. Lucr.iii.

εἰ εἴ—MS. Al. et. al. & Copt. Æth. & Vulg. which seems to be the true reading, because the apostle is making an inference from a passage in scripture. *If there be an animal body, there will also be a spiritual body.*—εἰ γὰρ ; Syr.

V. 45. The author's argument, to be logically conclusive, requires, that ο εσχάτος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνευματικὸν ζῶον· should be a scriptural declaration, as well as the former clause, which is found in Gen. ii. 7. otherwise the inference will not hold good. How far it might constitute a good *personal* conclusion, suited

suitable to the apprehensions of the christians of those days, is another question.

V. 46. As it is in the general constitution of things, so in this case also; the less perfect state will be antecedent to the more perfect.

V. 47. "The first man, created out of the earth, was perishable—mere dust—*χουκ*—*אמה*: the second man, who came from heaven, was heavenly, like his descent:" for the true reading seems to have been, *ο δευτερος ανθρωπος εξ ηρας, επεραν*: and then the correspondence between the two clauses is exact. So the *Vulgate secundus homo de caelo, caelestis*: and *Aeth.* *בשר, דם אמהי שמי*. The *Coptic* omits both *ο κυριος* and *επεραν*.

Homer somewhere says—*επει ηκαρα φυλον ομοιον*
Αθανασιωτε θεων, χαμαι ερχομενωνι ανθρωπων.

V. 49. *της εικονα τε χουκ*: the apostle seems here to allude to *Gen. v. 3. And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years; and begat a son in his own likeness, after his IMAGE.*

V. 50. *Corruptible flesh and blood* are not adapted to heavenly beings: See *Luke xx. 35—37.* and this proves the necessity of *another body.* *Βασιλειαν δευ*—not—the kingdom of God; which is an adequate representation of the sense: but *a kingdom of God*: i. e. the *Hebrew* phraseology, for *a divine and heavenly state of things.* The language of the *New Testament* is amazingly perverted by an inattention to the power of the *Greek articles.*

V. 51. There is a peculiarity of expression in this verse, which I suppose but few have noticed, and many will disallow, when it is pointed out:
a negative

a *negative* construction instead of a *positive*, which throws an obscurity over the author's meaning. The *adverb* *ou* belongs to *πᾶντες*, and not to the *verb*: *πᾶντες* ἢ κοιμηθήσονται, is equivalent to, *οὐδεὶς κοιμηθήσεται*, or to *πᾶντες ἐγερθήσονται*: so that the more intelligible translation would be, *We shall all awake, and we shall all be changed*.

So כֻּלָּם: Ecclef. i. 9. ἢ πᾶσα σὰρξ—Matt. xxiv. 22, &c.

Some, perhaps, may think, that the apostle intends a reserve in this place, according to 1 Theff. iv. 15—18. of those, who will be alive at the coming of the Lord. But the objections to this supposition are, that it will not suit the scripture phraseology, and would be exceedingly obscure; and that, as he is telling them a *mystery*, it appears, that he had not informed them minutely of the circumstances of the resurrection before.

The Vulgate reads, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur*. And so some MSS. The *Æthiopic* has the first clause—כֻּלָּם נָמוּת—*omnes moriemur*, and agrees with the Vulgate in the other.

V. 52. From the construction of the preceding verse, just established, it undeniably follows, that *the shortness of the sleep* and *the instantaneous change after death* are intended by those expressions *in a moment—in a twinkling of an eye*. In other words, the apostle means to say, that the interval between *death* and the *resurrection* will be *evanescent*; and not, that the time from the *beginning* of our *change* to its *completion* will be but a *moment*; for

VOL. VI.

H

this

this obviates no difficulty: for who disputes the ability of Omnipotence? Observe the tenor of the message: *We shall all awake, and shall all be changed, in a moment, in a twinkling of an eye, at, or by the last trumpet.*

V. 54. το φθαρτον τλο: i. e. *this corruptible nature, this corruptibility*, as it were: *σωμα* is not the substantive.

The first clause το φθαρτον τλο ενδυσσιναι αφθαρτων. is omitted by Copt. Æth. and Vulg.

V. 55. The *Vulgate* transposes the members of this verse.

V. 58. *αυλωννισιν*—Syr. Vulg. Æth. and MS. Al.

General Conclusions from the preceding Chapter.

1. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the most important point in the history of the gospel.
2. Our hopes of immortality depend entirely upon the reality of that doctrine.
3. The use of the resurrection of Christ was the *exemplification and ascertainment* of our own. His *death*, therefore, was not merely a proof of his *sincerity*; for this opinion abundantly contradicts the plainest and repeated declarations of the apostles, and supposes, that *miracles* are not an adequate testimony of a *divine commission*.
4. A life of rigorous virtue, according to the precepts of the gospel, is not in itself eligible, independent of its reward hereafter.

5. There

5. There is no happiness reserved for the righteous after death, previous to the second coming of our Lord, and the general resurrection.

6. The powers of Christ, as governor of the church, are only *delegated* and *occasional*; to be resigned hereafter into the hands of the supreme and only Potentate.

NEPIODIDASCALOS.

To the DIRECTORS *of the* THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING been for many years past inclined to favour the Arian principles respecting the pre-existence of Christ, and having lately read most of the principal writers on the Unitarian side of the question, I beg leave to state to you the situation of my own mind respecting a *christian duty* enforced and recommended by all the Gentlemen who have embraced the two before-mentioned opposite opinions, but a duty, which on Unitarian principles I do not feel myself able to discharge in such a manner as I apprehend I ought to do.

The duty I refer to is the love of Christ, or a lively and grateful sense of the obligation which I, as a christian, am under, to love and reverence him on account of the generous and benevolent part

H 2

which

which he acted when on earth, to promote the present interest and future salvation of mankind.

Whilst I entertained no doubts concerning the pre-existence of Christ, it appeared to me, that there must have been in his temper and disposition (previous to his assuming a body) not only that solicitude of approving himself to God, but also of doing the most benevolent offices to men, which entitles him to the warmest veneration and gratitude from us, on account of his having undertaken to assume a body, and to go through the various trying scenes, with which his life and death were attended.

I know not how other gentlemen of the Arian persuasion think on this subject, but whenever I dwelt in my own mind on the obligations I was under to love Jesus Christ for his coming into this world on such an errand, I always associated this idea—that it was a voluntary offer on the part of Christ, which might have been declined by him; and if so, might have been made by some other exalted spirit, but that from the strength and extent of his benevolent regard to man, he esteemed it as a joy set before him, that he should be, under God, the instrument of saving the children of men—and that on this account, he is the object of my particular gratitude and love—because his benevolence towards me and my fellow men induced him to esteem himself rewarded by being placed in such a situation as enabled him to make me and them happy.

But when I am weighing the several arguments advanced by the Unitarians against the pre-existence of Christ, and on their principles contemplate

his character as that of a mere man, raised up by God to be an illustrious prophet, inspired by him with that fulness of wisdom and power, which qualified him in so eminent a degree for discharging the several duties of his mission. I must own, that though, in some respects, I appear to have got rid of some difficulties and embarrassments attending the doctrine of his pre-existence, yet I do not (under this view of the subject) feel myself equally impressed as before with sentiments of love and gratitude to Jesus Christ, on account of the part which he performed when on earth to promote our salvation.

On the Unitarian principles Jesus Christ appears to me to be only a prophet, raised up by God to do the particular work which was appointed him—but as his talents and capacities as a mere man rendered him unequal to the service, the spirit of God was poured out upon him without measure—by it he was *actuated, directed*, and so far *strengthened*, that by this divine assistance he was able to do and say those things, which without it he could neither have said nor done—and therefore on these principles the gratitude which I owe for these benefits appears to be due to that gracious Being who prepared and qualified our Saviour by giving him this efficacious assistance, rather than to him, who was only the agent and instrument of the Father, and who was appointed by him to this office under such circumstances as could not but effectually secure the objects which were intended—For when I consider the prophecies which had been delivered concerning Christ, the then state of the world, which rendered the promulgation of christianity

so peculiarly proper at that time, and also the intentions of the divine Being as to the future improvement and reformation of mankind, I cannot suppose that our Saviour had it in his power to act, in any respect, so as in the least degree to have defeated the purposes of that infinite wisdom, by which he was continually directed.

For though it has been often mentioned as a proof of the excellence of our Saviour's character, that he did not employ the powers with which he was invested to ambitious and worldly purposes—yet it appears to me, that as these powers were given and continued to him by the Father, for the specific purposes of his mission, and as he acknowledged that it was *the Father who worked in him*, it cannot be on any good grounds supposed, that the same divine energy would have attended Christ on the supposition of its having been possible for him to have attempted the application of it to purposes directly opposite to those for which it was bestowed.

Am I not, therefore, on Unitarian principles, to consider Jesus Christ as the medium *only* through which the divine Being, in his infinite mercy and goodness, thought proper to convey his mind and will to the children of men?

The message being from God, I am sensible that it is not in my power sufficiently to love and adore him for his great mercy and goodness in sending it to me and my fellow men in any manner which, to his infinite wisdom, may appear best: but when I am attending to the frequent exhortations which are given—to love Jesus Christ on account of the character which he sustained, and the

the works which he wrought, &c. &c. &c. &c. whilst here upon earth. I do not perceive the force of any reasons which I have hitherto heard in support of the obligations of this duty ; nor do I yet see why, on Unitarian principles, Jesus Christ is the object of a christian's gratitude and love, any more than under the Jewish dispensation. Moses was the object of those affections to the Jews.

Perhaps it may be owing to the force of early impressions, but I cannot help owning, that should I finally settle my opinion in favour of the Unitarian principles, and should it be the consequence of these principles, that they have any tendency to abate the love and reverence which has hitherto appeared to me to be due to Jesus Christ, I have some doubts whether the expectation of appearing before that tribunal, at which the scriptures assure us he will preside, will not be attended in my own mind with additional circumstances of doubt and diffidence. However, as so many excellent christians have been firmly persuaded of the truth of Unitarian principles, I cannot but presume, that there are some views in which they consider this subject, with which I am unacquainted. If any of your correspondents have ever felt, and satisfied themselves on, the same difficulties I shall be happy to see their opinions on this subject. I am confident that it would be considered as a most acceptable service, and if it should be satisfactorily executed, would greatly contribute to the spread of the Unitarian principles ; for I know that many, who entertain some doubts about the pre-existence of Christ, are embarrassed with the before mentioned difficulty as much as myself.

H 4

Will

Will you, therefore, be so good as to request some of your Unitarian correspondents to state as distinctly as possible, on their own principles, *the nature and the obligation of a christian's love to Christ*. This is a point of so much importance, that I presume it must have engaged the closest attention of many Gentlemen, who have studied the controversy between the Arians and Unitarians; perhaps some of your friends have gone through the New Testament for the purpose of collecting all the passages in it which have any relation to *the love of Christ*.

St. Paul's declaration, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. is deserving of particular notice: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha." But I should be very happy to see, in one connected view, all that is said in the New Testament respecting this duty, and the explanations of those texts, on the supposition that Jesus Christ was a mere man, incapable of, and from himself, of acting as he did whilst on earth, if the Divine Spirit had not constantly animated, directed, and assisted him.

I am,

Your's, &c.

X. Y. Z.

To

*An Attempt to shew that the Cock-crowing
which Peter heard was the Sound of a
Trumpet.*

I Believe that most expositors are agreed in interpreting Matt. xxvi. 34. *Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice*, to mean, that before such a period Peter should three times deny him. But this interpretation, rational as it may be, by no means gets rid of the difficulty in ver. 74. *and immediately the cock crew*. The relation of all the Evangelists seems by no means compatible with the idea, that such a period of time should merely elapse before Peter's denial, for they are all express, that an *action* took place, that a *sound* was uttered. Mark xiv. 68. *And he went out into the porch, and the cock crew*. And verse 72, and the *second time the cock crew*. Luke xxii. 60. *and immediately while he yet spake, the cock crew*. John xviii. 27. *Peter then denied again, and immediately the cock crew*. It is impossible to interpret these passages of a mere *lapse of time*.

Many of your readers, I doubt not, imagine that this crowing was that of an animal, a common dunghill cock. But surely it wears more the appearance of a miracle of Mahomet than of Jesus (for every prophecy is a miracle) to rest his veracity as a prophet on the caprice of a dunghill-cock. Besides, for the greater assurance that this prophecy was really and truly fulfilled, the particular
cock

cock ought to have been specified, whether for instance it was Pilate's cock, or Nicodemus's cock, and this ought to have been watched by proper and credible witnesses, to ascertain to us that the cock in question had not crowed during the whole night, until the time that Peter had three times denied Christ.

The words of the evangelists must evidently be restricted to a particular cock, otherwise, instead of one miracle, we must suppose a thousand. For otherwise *all* the cocks of Jerusalem must have been miraculously restrained from crowing till Peter had three times denied his master, and then all their mouths, like that of Zacharias, to be immediately opened, and their tongues loosened. These difficulties doubtless are great, but they are not a little augmented by what the Rabbies tell us: for they positively deny that there were any cocks in Jerusalem. They say they were not permitted to be there on account of the holiness of the place, nor yet within some miles of it. For this reason the modern Jews never fail to make themselves merry about this cock helping out our Saviour's veracity at the expence of the historian's. See Wetstein's note on Matt. xxvi. 72.

I am now to attempt an interpretation, which steers clear of all these objections, and in my opinion removes every difficulty.

I would first of all premise, that Jerusalem was a military station, and had a strong garrison of always a thousand men, and during the feasts a much greater number. Hence we see Lyfias the tribune was able to spare at one time two hundred

hundred spearmen, and threescore and ten horsemen, and yet leave sufficient for the protection of the place. Acts xxiii. 23. These troops were stationed at the castle of Antonia, which overlooked the temple, under the command of a tribune. Whatever military customs, therefore, the Romans observed, concerning the placing and relieving the guard, and the instruments accompanying it, were observed at Jerusalem.

It is well known that the Romans, as well as the Greeks, divided the night into four watches of three hours each, i. e. from six in the evening to nine, from nine to twelve, from twelve to three, and from three to six. They are thus set down in Mark, xiii. 35. *Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning.* These watches, or guards (for the words *phuram* and *wurudā* are used the one for the other) were declared by the sound of a trumpet, and whenever one guard relieved another, it was always done by the sound of a trumpet. The whole four watches were closed by the blowing of a shrill horn. Drakenbörch says, the last trumpet, which blew at three in the morning, was sounded three times, to imitate the crowing of a cock; but from the words of Ausonius, it might be the shrill horn, which blew three times in imitation of a cock. And certainly this would render the imitation more striking. Among the innumerable proofs that it would be possible to bring of these things, take the following only.

Silius

Silius Italicus, lib. vii. p. 154. Edit. Drakenborch, has as follows :

Hæc secum ; mediam somni cum buccina noctem.

Divideret, jamque excubias sortitus iniquas.
On which Drakenborch has these two notes.

Note first :

——Mediam somni cum buccina noctem propria tamen clepsydris Romani noctem dividebant, tuba autem committebant ; et sicut tuba inchoabant sic cornicine claudebant ac revocabant vid. Veget. Lib. III. c. 8. de castrorum ordinatione. The passage of Vegetius to which he refers is this : “ Et quia impossibile videbatur in speculis per totam noctem vigilantes singulos permanere, ideo in quatuor partes ad clepsydram sunt divisæ vigiliæ, ut non amplius quam tribus horis nocturnis necesse sit vigilare. A tubicine omnes vigiliæ committuntur, et finitis horis a cornicine revocantur.” Drakenborch goes on. Quantum igitur tubicinem cornicea sequebatur. Quatuor vigiliæ erant Romanorum ut scribit Censorinus, cap. ix. de die natali. Eæ committebantur tuba, ut ad ejus sonitum cedenti prima succederet altera et sic deinceps, &c.

His other note is on these words :

——Excubias sortitus iniquas. Hinc Græci in *λακῇ* noctem dividebant a sortiando, ut animalia olim cum sortito ediscat, unde *πρωτακῇ ἢ μοιραῖς πρῶται*, pars prima et præcipua animalis. Quantum autem *λακῇ* respondebat quarta Romanorum tuba. Moschus Idyl. n. *Νυκτὸς δὲ τετραλὸν λακὸς ἰσλάσαι ἐγλυθὶ δ' ἡώς*. Tertium vero vigilem Silius propriorum nocti mediæ quam Gallicinio constitui-

tuit,

tuit, de his vide Censorinum, factum autem, quia tribus horis vigilia constabat, ut *φυλακη* spatium horarum trium Græcis interdum designet. Hanc autem tubam intelligit in fragmentis Lyricorum Poeta ille, qui pacis tempore Gallum solam tubam esse ait, quod nos in elegiis nostris ita expressimus,

Solaque quæ possit placidam tuba rumpere noctem.

Sopitis, placido sub Jove Gallus erit.

Quarta enim tuba in *αλεκτοροφωνία* proxima erat. In sacris libris in *οψε*, *ωσονυκτιον*, *αλεκτοροφωνιαν* et το πρωι nox dividitur. Ubi *οψε* ea pars est quam antiqui luminibus accensis, et prima face vocabant quâ concubium præcedit, ultima vespera, sicut το πρωι prima dici. Sic Petrus ter ante conticinium Christum negarat; ter enim canit Gallus in quo et quarta Romanorum tuba την αλεκτοροφωνιαν imitabatur, ter canebat enim.

—Tu clara instantis Eoi

Signa canit suus deprenso Marti Satelles.

AUSONIUS.

Thus it appears that the guard or watches were relieved by the sound of the trumpet. The two last watches were both of them called cock-crowings, because cocks usually crowed in that space of time. But as the *trumpet* sounded these watches, its *sound* was often called the crowing of the first *cock*, and the crowing of the second *cock*. And more especially the last sounding of the trumpet was called the crowing of the second cock, because, as Ausonius says, it blew three times, which Drakenborch says was in imitation of a cock.

Grav.

Græv. Antiq. vol. iv. p. 1184, says, Buccina committebant et distinguebant vigilias, unde boni scriptores ipsas vigilias buccinas appellant, ut ad primam, secundam, tertiam, quartam buccinam, id est, ad vigiliam.

They sent out their watches and divided them by a trumpet, whence good authors call these very watches *trumpets*, as the first, second, third, fourth *trumpet*, i. e. watch." But the two last watches they not only called the *third trumpet*, and *fourth trumpet*, but, as has been seen, the *crowing of the first cock*, and the crowing of the second cock. Thus Aristophanes, as quoted by Whitby, almost in the very words of Mark, calls the fourth trumpet, οὗ το δούτερον ἀνέχουσιν ἐφευγῆσαι, when the *second cock crowed*. And Juvenal Sat. ix L. 100. Quod tamen ad cantum Galli facit ille secundi. What he does at the crowing of the second cock.

These authors mention the crowing of the *second cock*, which Mark expresses by the *cock crowed the second time*. I conclude, therefore, that when our Master prophesied that before the cock crew twice Peter should deny him thrice, he did not stake his veracity on what never could be determined with precision, or on the caprice of an individual brute, but on a thing certain and constant—the trumpet sounding the fourth watch.

Thus, Mr Editor, an absurd miracle is got rid of, and christianity thereby rendered more credible, both to Jews and infidels.

ANGLO-SCOTUS.

P. S. It

called the Crowing of the Cock. 111

P. S. It is very probable that a guard was kept in part of the castle of Antonia, which overlooked the temple; for we find that Lyfias perceived the riot in the court of the Gentiles the moment it happened. The chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down and take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle. If the trumpet therefore sounded from such an eminence, it must easily have been heard all over the city, and especially at Caiphas' house, which cannot be supposed to have been at a great distance from the temple. At least, much easier than a cock's crowing.

I rejoice to find that Nepiodidasalos has undertaken a critical enquiry into the two first chapters of Luke's gospel. The doubts and difficulties of the commentators, even without any of his own, will furnish him with abundant matter.

Of the Observance of the Lord's Day.

[Continued from p. 38.]

I Now proceed, according to the intimation in my former paper, to examine the objections of Eubulus. That Gentleman says, that "an institution (of a day of cessation from all worldly business) cannot be productive of any valuable ends, but such as are easily to be attained without it," p. 342. Were the valuable ends, to be answered by the institution of the sabbath among the Jews, as easily attainable without it? If they *were*, what will Eubulus say to vindicate the divine wisdom in such an appointment? If they were *not*, what should render them attainable among christians, without their devoting one day of the week to religious exercises? Are christians differently constituted from Jews, or not susceptible of like impressions from sensible objects, and the engagements of business and pleasure? If this cannot be asserted with truth, as I presume it cannot, is not our withdrawing our attention from secular affairs during one day in seven, and transferring it to concerns of an infinitely more important nature, as expedient for us as it was for the Jews? Eubulus represents "a very small part of the great bulk of the people as having either inclination or *ability*, to employ the weekly returns of sabbatical idleness

VOL. VI. I nefs

ness in what are called religious exercises and meditations," p. 351. If the greater part of the mass of the people be neither inclined nor *able* to act in this manner on a day, in which law and custom oblige them to suspend their worldly pursuits, and they in general entertain an apprehension, though it do not properly influence their practice, that it ought to be spent in a religious manner, can there be any ground to expect, that they would be more disposed, or more able to dedicate a single hour of it, with greater seriousness and advantage, to religious employments, when they did not think themselves obliged to keep the whole of any day at all in a religious manner; and when through the rest of the first, and all the other days of the week, their minds were occupied with worldly affairs? Can one train of thoughts, continued by an unremitted attention to one particular set of objects for a long time together be dismissed, and a quite different one introduced, at will, and in an instant? At least, is it in the power of any besides the very few, who *habitually* maintain a pious frame of mind, to make so sudden a transition? This I take to be contrary to the law which universally operates in regulating the succession of our ideas, and to general experience.

Eubulus, supposing that "the institution of a day of rest from all worldly business—*induces* a very large majority of the most useful and most numerous part of the people, to mispend the seventh part of their time," p. 343, seems to insinuate, that there must be, in the very *nature* of such an institution, a tendency to produce this
unhappy

unhappy consequence. I think he must therefore arraign the wisdom of appointing a sabbath to the Jews, which, however, he does not appear inclined to do, as he seems to allow, that it was from God, and that christians would be bound to comply with a like institution, could such be proved to have been established among *them* by divine authority. Nevertheless, I do not see how he can avoid taking this step, unless he can show, that there is such a difference between the circumstances of Jews and christians, as that such an institution among the former *could not*, but among the latter *must* have a bad tendency, which is not to be compensated by any benefit, that can arise from it. It is not the circumstance of the Jews having been promised, that, if they duly obeyed their law, their land should be fruitful, and of christians having no such promise, and that therefore the former might safely abstain from rural business for one day in seven, whereas the latter cannot, which could make a sabbatical rest safe to the one, while it would be dangerous to the other, in a *moral view*; since in both cases alike the institution of such a rest must occasion the idleness, from which Eubulus apprehends the bad tendency of it to arise. It is also proper to be observed, that Eubulus, both here and in other places, argues the disuse of a thing from the abuse of it; a mode of reasoning which, if it were fair and conclusive, would prove in many instances too much, as hath been frequently remarked.

Eubulus says, that "without a positive injunction the strict observance of a sabbatical

rest is merely superstition." With such superstition, however (if their practice must be called such) I have shown in my former paper, that the apostles and first christians were chargeable. But the practice of the apostles must be a full justification of the present one of christians on the general grounds, on which their uniform conduct in any other instance challenges imitation.

It is inconceivable that Paul, who commanded his disciples to be followers of him, should not be aware, that christians would draw his conduct, and that of the other apostles, in so important an article as the observance of a day of religious rest, into a precedent, and that he and they would not therefore have taken care to guard them against so doing by a particular caution, had they entertained an idea, that under the christian dispensation *no* day of the week was to be religiously kept. Jesus and his apostles observed the Jewish sabbath, though not with the superstitious regard of Pharisees, which would have prevented them from doing acts of beneficence upon it. Had they thought, that not only that, but every other day of the week ought to be employed by christians in worldly business, would they not have dropped some intimation at least, that they fell into a compliance with the established custom of their country, merely as a temporary expedient for propagating the gospel among the Jews with the greater success; but that, when the expedient had produced all its effect, a discrimination of days ought to be entirely laid aside?

Perhaps

Perhaps Eubulus may observe that, according to my reasoning, christians ought to keep the Jewish sabbath, which very few of them are found to do. But I do not see how he can draw this consequence from it with respect to any besides Jewish converts at the most; which subject I leave to be discussed between him and Hermas. If such a consequence can be established with respect to *them*, it would be strange indeed, that the example of Jesus and his apostles should not carry with it the least shadow of authority with respect to the *rest* of their followers. The spirit and intention of an example may demand the highest regard, where there may be no apparent obligation to do the very same thing, that the person who sets the example hath done before. Jesus washed the disciples feet; yet we do not think ourselves bound to do the very same thing, though we allow, that this conduct of our Lord obliges us to be humble, and to condescend to the performance of any kind offices for one another. Jesus was a whole night in a *προσευχη*, where he doubtless employed all the time, either in direct addresses to his father, or in religious meditation, or in both. This cannot oblige his followers to spend whole nights in devotion in places appropriate for that purpose, though it certainly ought to induce them to cherish that devout frame of mind, which will qualify them for the proper discharge of the duty of prayer at stated times, and of any extraordinary acts of devotion, which peculiar circumstances may require. Jesus fed thousands at a time by miracle: it is impossible for us to

do the like; yet his relieving in this manner the wants of his attendants, as well as every other display of his benevolence, powerfully recommends to his followers the cultivation of a similar temper, and the exercise of it in acts of kindness. In short, different circumstances and situations, which do not at all diminish the obligation to follow a worthy pattern, may yet admit of great latitude as to the *manner, time, and instances*, in which a person is bound to do it. Though, therefore, the observance of the Jewish sabbath by our Lord and his apostles may not lay us under any obligation to keep *that* day, yet as it gave a sanction to the appointment of *one* day of the week for rest from bodily labour and religious exercises, it is plain, that they approved of *some* such appointment, and that they conceived, that without it religion would not be able to keep its ground in the world. If this had not been the apprehension of our Lord, but, on the contrary, that the direct tendency and inevitable effect of a sabbatical rest would be the corruption of the morals of his followers, and that every valuable purpose of such a rest might be much more easily and certainly obtained, without the suspension of worldly business for a whole day once a week, we could not reconcile it with the idea of his being a wise and benevolent legislator, to suppose that he would not only have neglected to enjoin an alteration of so dangerous a practice, but also have left it in the enjoyment of all the countenance and support, which the authority of his example could give it. But if he saw such a practice to be important,

important, and even essential for the preservation of religion among mankind, it is easy to account for his giving no express command to his followers, to set apart the first, or any other day of the week for religious exercises, in preference to the rest, as he might not think it material *which* day they kept; and not having the most distant apprehension, that, after what they had seen him do, and had been themselves accustomed from infancy to do, they would think themselves at liberty to keep *no* day at all, he might suppose that he could safely leave the *choice* of the day to the judgment of his apostles and first disciples. And if these were our Lord's ideas, he may fairly be supposed to have been so far from judging an express command to sanctify some *particular* day requisite, as Eubulus thinks, that he might regard such a command as superfluous.

Eubulus's assertion, p. 345, that "the apostles and first disciples of Jesus Christ, are no where said to have distinguished the first day of the week in any manner whatsoever," hath been already shewn in my former paper to disagree with facts. In the twentieth chapter of John, to which Eubulus refers, we find that the disciples assembled on the day of Christ's resurrection, and again on that day se'nnight; and though it were ever so clear, that they met only to confer about the testimony of their Lord's resurrection, it would be of very little consequence to the cause of Eubulus, while there remains such abundant evidence besides, that it was afterwards their custom to assemble on that day, for religious purposes. But with respect to the second of the

I 4

meetings

meetings recorded in that chapter, it is by no means so plain, that the disciples had no business together, but to talk about the evidence of their Lord's being risen. Between the time of that and the former meeting, a week had intervened, during which, as they must have had several opportunities of conversing on that subject, it is very improbable, that they then came together *merely* to renew such conversation. I should rather conjecture, that all the apostles, except Thomas, being convinced of the resurrection of their Lord, their second meeting was held in part at least, to commemorate that most important event, and that from this meeting is to be dated the commencement of the christian custom of solemnizing the Lord's day.

Eubulus thinks that the meeting spoken of Acts xx. 7. was evidently in the very beginning of the first day of the week, i. e. in the evening, after the business of the preceding day was over; or, as he elsewhere observes, according to the Jewish computation, in the evening of the Jewish sabbath, or our Saturday, and that it is probable, the disciples were then met to participate of the the Lord's supper, p. 346. In p. 353, he seems to intimate, that the rite of the supper was celebrated in the *evening* of the Lord's day, and to assign that as a reason why the celebration of it should not interfere with the usual hours of business. How are the representations in these two passages to be reconciled? But not to dwell on this apparent inconsistency, I would ask, where is there the least proof that the meeting under consideration was in the evening of the seventh day.

day. I can find none in the history. But if we reflect that Paul hastened, if it were *possible* for him (attend to the force of these words) to be at Jerusalem the day of pentecost, ver. 16, we shall see reason to suppose, that Paul tarried several days at Troas, in order to meet the disciples of that place on the Lord's day, and keep it with them according to their custom, before he proceeded on his journey. And if this was the case, he must leave Troas early on the morning of Monday. See Wolfii. Cur. Phil. Dr. Whitby in Loc. and Dr. Benson's history of the first planting of christianity. B. 3. ch. 7 sect. 9.

The next passage quoted by Eubulus is 1 Cor. xvi. 2. in which the apostle says not a syllable about settling accounts, but merely orders the Corinthian converts to lay by, or throw into a common stock, what they could afford for the relief of the saints at Jerusalem, to prevent the trouble of making a collection when he should come to receive their bounty. They had no need to examine into their gains on the Lord's day, to see what part of them they could conveniently employ in charity. That they could easily do at any time before the day came, on which the collection was to be made.

Eubulus having considered all the passages (as he thinks, but which I have shewn in my former paper, to be by no means the case) "which
" even by inference recommend the keeping the
" first day of the week sacred as a sabbath day," adds, "there are others which expressly teach us
" that the gospel does not require of its disciples
" any such observance," and he grounds his asser-
tion

tion first on the apostolic decree mentioned Acts xv. This decree was occasioned in the following manner. Certain person had gone from Judea to Antioch, and taught the brethren of that place, that they must be circumcised in order to be saved, ver. 1. Between those persons and Paul and Barnabas, there arose so great a dissension, that it was thought necessary to send the latter to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, to take their opinion upon the subject in dispute. Accordingly the question was brought on, and agitated in a council convened there for the purpose, and their decision is well known. Now if we consider what gave origin to the decree, viz. the dispute that had arisen at Antioch, whether the gentile converts ought to be circumcised, and what was the end which the fabricators of it had in view, viz. to remove obstructions to fraternal union between them and the Jewish converts, I think we shall readily perceive, that it was intended to enjoin only those things, which the gentile converts might be in danger of not otherwise attending to, and of thereby giving unnecessary offence to the Jewish; leaving the former at full liberty to act in concert with the latter in all cases wherein their christian freedom was not concerned, and there was a consent of opinions between the two parties. If this be admitted, the gentile converts might keep a weekly sabbatical rest, without offending against the spirit or design of this decree, or resigning any right enjoyed by their christian profession. That they had no idea of their being forbidden by the decree to observe such a rest, is evident from what

3

hath

hath been shewn to have been their practice in this respect. And indeed, had they distinguished no day of the week from the rest, by keeping it sacred, and abstaining from worldly business, supposing themselves to be released by the Jerusalem council from all obligation to do so, there can be no doubt but that, considering the zeal of the Jewish converts for the law, we should have heard of their frequently censuring such a conduct, which must have appeared to them highly criminal. But where do we meet with any thing of the sort?

Though it be allowed, that "to say that only such and such particulars of a law are necessary to be observed, is plainly and expressly to declare that every other particular is unnecessary," it must be also granted, that it is to indulge a *liberty* with respect to those *other* particulars of the law, and to permit the observance of *such* of them as are not otherwise forbidden by the authority which enjoins the observance of certain particulars of it. That the council of Jerusalem were of this opinion, appears from the subsequent behaviour of the apostles, and particularly from that of Paul, who afterwards circumcised Timothy at the very time when he was employed in delivering the decrees in various cities, and who attended the worship of the synagogue on the sabbath days. Acts xvi. beginning, xvii. 2. xxi. 24.

I beg leave also to remark, with respect to the articles contained in the decree (that relating to *fornication* excepted, which is forbidden by the divine law, whether communicated by the light of

of reason or of revelation) that they seem to have been framed merely to preserve harmony between the Jewish and gentile converts, and not to be binding in future, when the peace of the church should no longer require the observance of them. After the several articles are enumerated, it is added, *From which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well.* This language appears to me to show plainly, that all the injunctions, except the one concerning fornication, were founded on maxims of prudence, which affected the then state of things, and that they were not intended to bind christians in future ages, when, if they should be no longer regarded, there would be no danger of a schism in the church becoming the consequence. To the idea just suggested, relating to the continuance of the obligation of the decree, the determination of our Lord, which must have been known to the apostles, that *what entereth into the man cannot defile the man*, and the observations of Paul about the eating of things offered to idols. (1 Cor. viii.) also lead. Now, if what is here advanced be well founded, we shall see sufficient reason for the observance of a sabbatical rest not being prescribed in the decree, viz. because with respect to that matter there was no disagreement between the two sorts of converts, and because the obligation to such an observance would remain, when that to the observance of other particulars of the decree would cease.

I would farther take notice, that the reason assigned by James, to whose opinion the council acceded, for the injunctions he proposed to have
laid

laid on the gentile converts, shows, that they did not intend by their decision to prohibit the observance of a sabbatical rest, and that the decree itself implies the existence of a religious intercourse and communion between the two sorts of converts. The words of James, alluded to, are, *For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.* The reason contained in these words implies, that the Jewish converts continued to attend the synagogues on the sabbath day, and convey no censure of their conduct in so doing. If, on their reception of christianity, they had withheld, or been ordered to withhold, their attendance at those places on that day, where would have been the pertinence of observing, that Moses was then read in them? James's reason is evidently founded on the supposition, that they did still assemble with the Jews on their sabbath, and that by this means their attachment to the law was still kept up, which rendered it necessary for their christian brethren from among the gentiles to conform, in the instances specified in the decree, to their practice. But this conformity could only be needful on the supposition that the Jewish and gentile converts were incorporated into one body, and at stated times met together to join in the same religious exercises. For had there not subsisted a religious union of this sort between them, and the object of the decree had been only to preserve an intercourse and friendship of a *civil* nature between them, the decree would have been superfluous, as such an object might have been as easily and effectually secured with respect to these two bodies of people,

as

as with respect to either of them and those who were without the pale of the christian church, by means of kind and courteous behaviour. Col. iv. 5. 1 Theff. iv. 12. I, therefore, think, that we are constrained to infer from the decree, and the reason assigned for passing it, that the Jewish converts attended the synagogues on the sabbath, that they were not blamed for so doing, and that between them and the gentile converts there subsisted a church-union of great importance, in the estimation of the apostles; to the cause of christianity and their own religious improvement, and therefore highly proper to be maintained. And as we have seen distinct evidence from the scriptures, that the Lord's-day was kept sacred in the first age of the church, this decree, instead of forbidding such a practice, is a proof that it enjoyed the approbation of the apostles; in as much as they thought it requisite to order the gentile converts to avoid certain things, which would give umbrage to their brethren converted from judaism, and produce a separation between them in their social and public worship.

Eubulus, secondly, grounds his assertion, that the gospel does not require of its professors the observance of any thing like a sabbatical rest, on the design of Paul's epistle to the Galatians. I readily allow, that the object of the apostle in this letter was to prove, that the gentile converts were not required to observe any of the Jewish ordinances. But how it can be concluded from thence, either that they did not keep one day of the week sacred, or that they should look upon themselves as exempted from all obligation to do
any

any thing of the kind, I do not perceive. That the primitive christians did *actually* observe the first day of the week in a religious manner, hath been already shown; and the Galatians would have drawn a very strange inference, if, because they had been told, that they were not bound to observe, among other Mosaic institutions, that of the *Jewish* sabbath, they had considered themselves as not obliged to keep *any* day of the week holy. Their being pronounced free from the yoke of Jewish ceremonies could not have been fairly construed to mean, that they would sacrifice their christian liberty, or act inconsistently with it, by observing the day on which their Lord rose from the dead, and which the apostles themselves had distinguished by marks of peculiar regard. Therefore, when Paul tells the Galatians, that he was afraid of having bestowed upon them labour in vain, because they observed days, and months, and times, and years, he could be fairly understood by them to do no more than express his disapprobation of their unnecessarily encumbering themselves with the observance of institutions, to which, as gentile converts they could be under no obligation to submit. Would a protestant church in a country of heathens, where there were also persons of the popish profession, conclude, on receiving from the man by whom they had been converted, a letter, containing exhortations, that they would not suffer themselves to be prevailed on by their popish neighbours to join them in the observance of fasts and festivals not prescribed by their religion, that their friend ordered or wished them not to sanctify any day at all, when such a practice was recom-

recommended by his own conduct, and followed by the christian world in general?

Upon the whole, I think we must suppose, that there was an irreconcilable disagreement between the practice and language of Paul, or a most unaccountable want of any thing like system in his way of thinking, or of attention in his mode of writing, unless it be allowed, that in the passages in which he reasons on the impropriety of the gentile converts adopting Jewish ordinances, he had not the most distant reference to the sanctification of a christian sabbath.

That the reader may see how ill-founded is the observation of Eubulus, that the christians of the three first centuries did not observe any day as a sabbath, p. 348, 349, nothing more is necessary than to refer him to the authors before quoted; to whom may be added Joseph Mede, from whose discourse concerning churches, or appropriate places for christian worship, it seems evident, that from the days of the apostles such a day hath been kept. I refer to him only as producing evidence of the existence of places of public worship, and of what was done in them in the first ages of the church; from which the conclusion appears to be just, that one day of the week was then kept holy. Direct proofs of this may be seen in the other authors referred to. See Mede's Works, B. ii.

Eubulus asserts, but says nothing to prove, that Abraham and the patriarchs kept no sabbath. Directly the reverse I apprehend to have been asserted by many learned men, who have endeavoured to prove, that one day in seven hath been set apart for religious purposes from the beginning
of

of the world. But not to enter into the discussion of this subject, which doth not appear to have much, if any connexion, with the present dispute, I proceed to observe, that, if the first christians, as Eubulus says, met early in the morning, or in the evening, it was probably for fear of their enemies; but that, as often as they could do it with safety, they employed other parts of the Lord's day in the public services of religion. For the proof of this fact I must beg leave to refer the reader as before.

It is well known, that people who live in villages and country places, are the last to change their opinions and practices. This circumstance will furnish a much better reason than that assigned by Eubulus for Constantine's not extending his order to suspend their worldly business on the Lord's day to those places, p. 350. If the views of that prince were entirely political, his conduct may much more justly be ascribed to a dread of exciting discontents. The reason given by Eubulus for this conduct of Constantine is so expressed, that it may lead an unwary reader to think much more favourably of it than it deserves. He represents Constantine, as "providently apprehending, that the suppression of agriculture and other rural occupations for *one seventh* of the year might in some seasons be, at least locally, attended with very fatal consequences." A reader, who runs over this passage in great haste, and without reflecting, may inadvertently conceive this seventh part of the year to mean one *connected* period. It is true, he must read with very little attention not to correct his mistake immediately; but if he did correct it, I

VOL VI.

K

think

think he must at once discover the improbability of Constantine's having acted with the view ascribed to him by Eubulus. This thought would at once suggest itself to his mind, that if Constantine, for any reason whatever, chose to injoin on mechanics, manufacturers, &c. in cities and large towns, the suspension of business one day in seven, by which they would be deprived of one seventh part of their gains, he might easily have obviated the objection, which his subjects in country places were likely to make on account of the fatal consequences, which Eubulus supposes him to have been aware of, by inserting a proviso in his decree, that, to preserve the fruits of the earth in precarious seasons, they should be permitted to work on the Lord's day. But what could have induced this prince to have enjoined a sabbatical rest on *any* part of his subjects, seeing he would thereby deprive the community of the benefit of a seventh part of their labour, and the persons themselves of the same proportion of their gains, if he had not found such an institution subsisting among christians? If he wished to pay his court to the clergy, and to secure their attachment, he might have easily obtained that end without increasing their duty. If the christian laity had been accustomed to pay stipends to their ministers for the short service of an hour at the beginning or close of one day in the week, the rest of which they employed in worldly business, and had no idea of the sacredness of one day above another, would it have been political in the prince, or likely to be pleasing to his people, to introduce among them a weekly sabbatical rest, by which they would be deprived of a part of their usual gettings.

gettings, and which they had not before been taught to consider themselves as bound to keep? I am; therefore, fully of opinion, that Eubulus ascribes the conduct of Constantine to a wrong cause, and that his injoining at all the observance of a weekly rest argues, that he found such a custom among christians, and, for some reason or other, wished to make it as general in his empire, as he thought he could do it with safety.

Part of what Eubulus says, p. 351, is perfectly just; but I cannot agree with him, that, because the religion of the gospel ought to influence the minds, and direct the practice of its professors in every action and moment of their lives, the appointment of any *particular* days or seasons for religious meditation is superfluous and unnecessary. The quite contrary inference appears to me the only just one, and for reasons founded on the state of things, which he proceeds to describe. For if, as Eubulus represents, a very small part of the great bulk of the people be inclined to employ the day of sabbatical rest in religious exercises and meditations, now that it enjoys the countenance of law and general custom and opinion, is there the least shadow of probability, that, if they pursued their business and pleasures every day of the week, they would feel more of a religious temper? Is it not evidently the influence of such pursuits for six days, not duly counteracted by private meditation and devotion, that tends to disqualify them for the religious exercises of the seventh? What less, then, could be expected from their being engaged *every* day in those pursuits, without having their attention called for

.K 2 a considerable

a considerable portion of one day in the week to religious and moral subjects, than the total extirpation of all pious and virtuous feelings from their minds, and the most alarming licentiousness in their manners? Could they indeed be prevailed on steadily to perform the religious duties of the closet and family, and uniformly to govern their thoughts, affections, and actions, by the rules of the gospel, without keeping a sabbatical rest, the duty of observing such an institution, as far as it arises from the religious and moral tendency of such a conduct, would be superseded. But upon what grounds can such an event be expected?

Suppose the alteration, pleaded for by Eubulus were adopted, would the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life be abated? Would the man now enslaved to either of those lusts, be likely, when he had more time and additional opportunities for indulging it, to become less so, to perform with more frequency or fervour the devotion of the closet or the family than he does at present, or to attend public worship for an hour twice or thrice a week, with more constancy or benefit than he does now the services of the church on the Lord's day? All just reasoning from the state of things in the world, and the constitution of the human mind forbids the hope of such events. And it appears to me exceedingly strange, that Eubulus should not have been aware, that, in proportion as his scheme would allow more time for the pursuit of business and pleasure, it would render mankind more worldly-minded and sensual, and thereby more disinclined and unable to engage in religious exercises at *any* time.

As

As to the model of prayer taught by our Lord, it is evident from the occasion on which it was prescribed, and his direction to his disciples to enter into their closets to pray, that it was designed to guide them as to the subjects of their private devotions, though it contains no subject improper to be introduced into public devotions. The command of the apostle, that prayers should be made for kings, and for all in authority, taken in connexion with the end to be answered by making them, plainly relates in a more peculiar manner to public worship.

I entirely agree with Eubulus in opinion, that the present mode of preaching is not systematical enough; and I doubt not, but that it would prove a very useful alteration, to substitute regular and connected expositions of the scriptures in the place of sermons on one part of the Lord's day. Perhaps, as christians have been always accustomed to hear sermons, it would be improper, for that and other reasons, to lay aside the use of them entirely.

From what hath been before observed, I think it must be evident to all, who will give themselves the trouble to reflect, that the abolition of a sabbatical rest, instead of diminishing, would greatly increase the number of executions.— There is not the least reason for supposing, that fewer would be idle, expensive, and dissolute, or that the obligations to diligence, sobriety, justice, and honesty, would be more generally felt and attended to, but the contrary. The motives which now determine the unhappy creatures, who fall victims to public justice, to pursue those courses which bring them to an
K 3 untimely

untimely end, would probably operate with still greater force, and extend their influence to many others, who now resist and overcome their power. For so little would there be left of the appearance of religion in the world, and so much more disinclined would the generality be to cherish its principles in their minds, in consequence of being so entirely immersed in worldly business and pleasure, that the vicious would grow more hardened in iniquity, and their proselytes become daily more and more numerous.

Eubulus, after having allowed, that the institution of sunday schools will certainly be of benefit, informs us, that that benefit will be of very short duration; for that, when young people have ceased to attend those schools, they will soon be blended with the general mass of the people of their own rank, and be assimilated to them. Should, then, no care be taken to instil good principles into the minds of children, because early impressions may afterwards be effaced? Are there not some instances to justify the observation, *Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it?* As I hope and trust, that Eubulus is right in his apprehension, that "his reasoning will have but a small chance of success in a conflict with the inveterate universal prejudice in favour of a sabbatical rest," so I flatter myself, that the good effects already seen to be produced by Sunday schools will cause them to be established every where throughout the kingdom.

Many observations might be added to recommend the continuance of the practice condemned by

by Eubulus. If what I have written should be thought a full answer to that Gentleman, who appears to be a well wisher to the interests of virtue, and should draw a more general attention to the duty of observing the Lord's day, it will be a full recompence for the labour of,

Gentlemen,
Your very humble servant,
PHILANDER;

On the Elijah foretold by Malachi.

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

FROM the essay of Christophilos upon the Mission of John the Baptist, published in the fourth and fifth volumes of your Repository, I have received much instruction and entertainment. My satisfaction, however, would have been more complete, had the ingenious author pointed out the propriety with which the Baptist is called by the name of Elias : had he shewn the coincidence of character that really subsisted between the two prophets ; and made it appear that the former was intended in the prediction of

K 4 Malachi,

Malachi, concerning the second coming of the latter. I have considered this question with attention; and cannot help apprehending that some mistake must have arisen in representing *John* as the *Elias* that was to come; and that he was actually in the right when he refused the title.

The passages in which our Lord is represented as affirming John to be *Elias*, are the following: Matt. xi. 14. After passing high encomiums upon his forerunner, Jesus proceeds, "And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence; and the violent take it by force; for all the prophets and the law, prophesied until John: and if ye will receive *him*, this is *Elias* which was for to come." *i. e.* It is predicted of *Elijah*, that he shall produce a wonderful conversion, and save those he preaches to, Mal. iv. 6. Now if ye receive this John the Baptist as ye ought, he will convert you; will ward off your destruction, and answer the character which Malachi gives of the future *Elijah*. That the clause *ei tereis descardou* has this meaning, rather than *if ye will admit, or believe it*, I think probable, from the behaviour of some of John's hearers, ver. 18. Luke xx. 5.

In a discourse consequent upon the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 12. Mark ix. 13.) our Lord thus speaks: "But I say unto you, that *Elias* is come already; and they knew him not; but have done unto him whatever they listed: likewise also shall the son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist. Luke i. 17, The angel tells Zacharias, that John should go before

fore Jesus, in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, &c. The authenticity of this introduction to St. Luke's gospel appears to me so very suspicious*, that I think little stress is to be laid upon it, as a *separate* testimony: and if we admit not this introduction, it is remarkable, that neither Luke nor John have ever noticed that the expected Elias was the Baptist. We may also observe, that in Mark's account of the transfiguration, chap. ix. 10. the disciples present at that scene, were commanded to tell no man, till the son of man was risen from the dead: they then questioned one with another, what *the rising from the dead* should mean, *i. e.* whether it meant a simple re-animation, or the coming of the Messiah in his kingdom: and apprehending it possibly might be the latter, they ask, 'Why say the Scribes that Elias must *first* come;' *i. e.* before the rising from the dead? In like manner the prophet tells us, 'I will send you Elijah before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. Mal. iv. 5. So that neither from the prediction of Malachi, nor the expectations of the Scribes, have we any reason to suppose that the coming of Elias was to be prior to the *preaching of Jesus*.

If we compare the respective histories of Elijah and the Baptist, as related in the scriptures, we shall find them very far from encouraging us to suppose they were similar characters. The

* See Theological Repository, vol. IV. V. on the *Miraculous Conception*.

particulars recorded of Elijah are these: He opened his commission, by declaring to Ahab, that there should be no dew nor rain these years, but according to his word. After which, he was commanded to retire to the brook Cherith, before Jordan, where the ravens fed him. When this brook was dried up, for want of rain, he went to Zarephath, where the widow, whose meal and oil he multiplied, and whose son he raised from the dead, sustained him. 1 Kings xvii. After many days, he was ordered to shew himself again unto Ahab: for God would send rain on the earth. As Obadiah was on his way, in search of grass to save the cattle, he met Elijah, recognised him, and was prevailed on to bring him to Ahab. At this interview Elijah procured a contest between Jehovah and Baal; and in consequence of the Almighty's answer by fire, the prophets of the idol were slain. He then foretels the fall of a great rain, which immediately comes to pass. 1 Kings xviii. To avoid the threats of Jezebel, he went to Beersheba, and afterwards proceeded a day's journey into the wilderness; and, as he was sleeping under a juniper tree, was fed by an angel, and went in the strength of that meat unto Horeb. When lodged there in a cave, he received a commission to anoint Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha; with an assurance that there were seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal. 1 Kings xix. The next thing recorded of him is, that he denounced destruction against Ahab for the murder of Naboth, chap. xxi. When Ahaziah, the son of Ahab, sent messengers to enquire of Baalzebub,

zebub, concerning his sickness, Elijah met them, and foretold that the king should not recover. On this occasion the prophet is described as a hairy man, girt with a girdle of leather about his loins. After which Ahaſiah ſent unto him three captains, with fifty men each, at three ſeparate times; on two of which, with their attendants, he called down fire from heaven, and conſumed them. But with the third captain, and his fifty, he went to the king; and declared to him, that he ſhould not come down off that bed on which he was gone up. 2 Kings i. We next find him with Eliſha, at Bethel; after that, at Jericho, when he divided Jordan, and paſſed over with his companion; who begged for a double portion of his ſpirit; when a chariot and horſes of fire appeared, and Elijah was carried up into heaven. Eliſha took up Elijah's mantle, and divided the waters of Jordan: upon which, the prophets that ſaw him, ſaid, 'The ſpirit of 'Elijah doth reſt on Eliſha,' 2 Kings ii. In conſequence of which he *wrought miracles*, and uttered prophecies.

The ſummary we have of the life and miſſion of John the Baptiſt, is, that the word of the Lord came unto him in the wilderneſs; and that he went into the country round about Jordan, baptizing, and preaching repentance: that he declared the approaching advent of a ſuperior prophet, whoſe harbinger he profeſſed himſelf, and whom he afterwards baptized. After having in many things exhorted the people, he was ſhut up by Herod, whoſe vicious converſation he had re-
proved.

proved. From his confinement he sent disciples to Jesus, to enquire whether he was the Messiah; and was honoured with our Lord's most ample testimony. But he was beheaded at the instance of Herodias, during the time perhaps of this journey of his disciples. See Theol. Repos. vol. v. p. 270.

Now in what does the similitude of character between this man and Elijah appear to consist, that the former should be called by the name of the latter; and that the Baptist should be said to come in the spirit and power of Elias? When the sons of the prophets say concerning Elisha, that the spirit of Elijah doth rest on him (2 Kings ii. 15.) we immediately see the propriety of the observation; because the miracles of the one, resemble those of the other. Compare 2 Kings ii. 8. with ver. 14.—1 Kings xvii. 16. 22, with 2 Kings iv. 6. 35.—1 Kings xviii. 41. with 2 Kings iii. 16. But how can we suppose John to come in the spirit and power of Elias, when he wrought no miracle? The subject of Elijah's commission was to denounce vengeance against idolatry, and declare the unity and supremacy of Jehovah: John preached against hypocrisy, inculcated the necessity of repentance and moral rectitude. John was only the harbinger of a superior; Elijah was the principal of his time. John collected a number of disciples: not so the other. John was imprisoned, and afterwards beheaded: we read not that Elijah was ever under confinement; and are positively informed that he did not die at all.

Com-

Commentators indeed imagine the parallel to be compleat, when they discover that John had the spirit of Elijah, equalling, if not exceeding him, in zeal for God, in severity of manners, in courage, and in sustaining persecutions. Thus Dr. Macknight, on Luke i. 17. But a reader must be not a little prejudiced in favour of the supposed familiarity, or he will perceive that the very instances this learned man produces, strongly militate against his hypothesis; and where they do not, are not sufficiently characteristic, and appropriated to these prophets. John, says he, *had a garment of camels hair*. Now of Elijah it is said, that he was a hairy man. The Doctor has omitted the circumstance of the leathern girdle about the loins of both. *He fed on locusts and wild boney*. We read not that this was the viand of Elijah. See 1 Kings xvii. 6. 15. xix. 6. *He rebuked sinners of the highest distinction with great boldness*. So did all the prophets. *And was put to death on that account*. So was not Elijah. *Though he did no miracle* (a sufficient instance of dissimilarity) *he was honoured with the like success, in restoring the lost spirit of true religion among his countrymen*. Nay, he even excelled Elijah, in that which is properly the power of a prophet, and to which all his other gifts are subservient, the power of converting men. *Being in this more successful without miracles, than Elijah had been with them*. But the objects of their mission were different: the one bent himself principally against royal idolatry, the other against general hypocrisy and immorality. That this Elias to whom John is compared, was Elijah the Tishbite, we cannot

3

help

help concluding, from the frequent and undoubted mention of that prophet in the New Testament. Luke iv. 25. ix. 54. Rom. xi. 2. James, ch. v. 17. We can by no means suppose that the person whom the Baptist resembled, was one of that name, but of a different character, and not mentioned in the Old Testament. A distinction would most certainly have been made, for fear any one should have hastily, not to say unavoidably concluded, that he of whom sacred writ makes notable mention, was here intended.

If we turn to the prophecies of Malachi, we shall find that neither of them relate to the baptist. Chap. iii. 1. Jehovah is the speaker. See Lindsey's Sequel, p. 183.

'Behold! I will send my messenger,¹

And he shall prepare the way before me.²

And the Lord,³ whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his palace.⁴

Even the messenger of the covenant in whom ye delight:

Behold! he shall come, saith Jehovah, God of
of Hosts.'

See Bishop Necome's improved version.

1. Who would not understand the same person to be intended by the term *messenger*, in the first and fourth lines, viz. the messiah, introducing the kingdom of Jehovah. Apoc. xi. 15.

2. He shall perform the office of *strator*, when Jehovah marches on the following expedition. See Bishop Lowth's Isaiah, ch. xl. 2.

3. *The Lord*, means the Messiah, the king of Israel, who was to come; and that *suddenly*, in the clouds of heaven. מָלְכָא, the term here used is
often

often applied to the king of Israel, 1 Sam. xxix. 8. 2 Sam. xiv. 17. xv. 21.—applied also to Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 7.

—whom ye seek, i. e. upon the credit of Daniel's prophecy, chap. vii.

4. *His palace*, *היכל*; which signifies *temple*, only in reference to the supposed residence of the king of the Jews.

In this passage I can find no reference to John the Baptist, notwithstanding its being accommodated to him, in the usual manner of the New Testament writers. The quotation does not agree with the Hebrew. Our Lord is indeed represented as saying concerning his forerunner, 'This is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face,' &c. Matt. xi. 10. Luke vii. 27. But that person can have paid but little impartial attention to the citations in the New Testament from the Old, who imagines that they are always applied to the purpose of their author, and with the same view in which they stand in the original. The reason which made our Lord apprehend that the passage before us referred to the Baptist, will probably be explained hereafter. Though in truth, whatever be the meaning of this prediction, no one will affirm that we are taught by it to look upon John as the promised Elijah.

Again, Malachi, iv. 5. "Behold I will send
"unto you Elijah the prophet, *before the great*
"*and terrible day of Jehovah come*; that he may
"convert the heart of the fathers, together with
"the children; and the heart of the children,
together

"together with their fathers, lest I come and smite the whole earth * with utter destruction."

I have observed before, that the mission of Elijah was to precede, not the coming of Christ in his prophetic character, but the coming of the great and terrible day of Jehovah. Elias was also to *restore* all things: the word we render *convert* †, is by the LXX. translated ἀποκαταστήσει. Comp. Matt. xvii. 11. He was to convert the hearts of the fathers and children, *lest* Jehovah should come, and smite the whole earth, or the land, with a curse, or utter destruction. But such powers are never attributed to John: his highest aim was to prepare men for Christ; nor was his preaching in fact so successful. He could not prevent the destruction even of his native country: Jerusalem was overthrown, notwithstanding his mission. Dr. Macknight, indeed, tells us, on Luke i. 17. that John, "by his preaching made such a general change upon the manners of the nation, that he turned the hearts of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to their children the Jews; from whom they had been alienated, on account of their wickedness; and the hearts of the children to their fathers, by begetting in them a love of religion, and religious characters; and by so doing, prepared a people for the coming of the Lord." But surely, if this was the case, he somewhat superceded the necessity of another preacher of

* Three MSS. one margin, and the Chaldee read בלדוארץ.

† משיב.

righteousness

righteousness to follow him so closely; and whether the description here given of the effects of the Baptist's preaching be not overcharged, let the reader judge. As to the *restoration of all things*, St. Peter (Acts iii. 19.) looks upon it as an event posterior to the ascension of Jesus, and how could it have been consistent to predicate any thing future of Elias, when that Elias was dead at the time? Should it be said, that John may likewise be the harbinger of Jesus at his second coming; and that he will, at that time, appear in a new character, corresponding to this of Elijah; I answer that if such had been our Lord's meaning, he would hardly have declared that Elias was *already* come; because the Baptist had not entered upon that part of his commission, and could not yet be called by that name. From our Lord's discourse, his hearers could not but understand, that the Elias the Scribes expected, was both come, and dead: and that it would be in vain to look for another of that description. They were not likely to infer, without the most express declaration, that John, as well as the Son of man, should arise again from the dead; and complete the part of his trust which he had left unfinished. Our Lord continues, that his contemporaries knew not John, or did not acknowledge him. How then could this be he whose mission was to be attended with such brilliant success? Mr. Mede is forced upon the hypothesis of John's second coming, to fulfil the prophecy of his restoring all things. Works, p. 99. and the learned Mr. Taylor, in the first dissertation annexed to the *Thoughts on the grand apostacy*,
 VOL. VI. L

tacy, Pt. 1. p. 176, frankly owns, 'there was no such harbinger as Elias, no such restoration before the desolation.' And it is highly improbable, that had Jesus been persuaded he should return, the disciples should not, especially in this place, have been informed of it; and utterly inconceivable that our Lord should, without any limitation, or reserve, for what should hereafter come to pass, have declared, 'Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed.' With respect to the future tense in the preceding verse, 'Elias *shall* first come, &c.' it may be accounted for, by supposing Jesus to adopt the form of expression usual among the scribes upon this occasion. What you have learned from the prophets, viz. that Elias will first come, is true:—he is come indeed already.'

What then appears to be the state of the case? Till I receive better information, I cannot help conjecturing, that our Lord himself, if Matthew and Mark have accurately represented his opinions, was mistaken on this particular point. 'The old prophets,' says Mr. Mede, p. 98. 'for the most part spake of Christ's coming indefinitely, and in general, without that distinction of first and second coming, which we have more clearly learned in the gospel. For this reason those prophets (except Daniel, who distinguishes those comings, and the gospel out of him) speak of the things which should be at Christ's coming indefinitely, and all together.'

And we know that the apostles, after the resurrection of Christ, imagined it possible, that the kingdom

kingdom might soon be restored (*αποκαταστασις*) to Israel (Acts i. 6. i. e.) that the kingdom of the Messiah, predicted by Daniel, might at that time be set up. Our Lord does not either confirm, or contradict their expectation. He tells them, it was not for them to know the times and seasons, which the Father had put in his own power. Whence we may clearly infer, that Jesus did not assert that the kingdom of God would, or would not, be set up at present; and that his discourse implied, that he did not know when it would be established. It was kept a secret from him, as well as from his disciples. Now though he was fully instructed in the *nature* of the kingdom he should be instrumental in erecting, it does not follow that he was acquainted with *the time of its commencement*. He knew that himself was to be the Messiah; but appears to have fallen in with the notions of preceding prophets, and his countrymen, that no long time would elapse before he should appear in glory. With this idea, and knowing also that he should soon be put to death, and raised again as the great sign of his mission, we cannot be surprized at his fancying, that to his own harbinger was applicable the prediction of Malachi, which foretold the coming of a prophet, whose business it was to preach repentance before the great and terrible day of Jehovah. That day being imagined so near at hand, the declaration of Malachi could be referred to no other*, except himself; and he seems to have thought the two characters of Eli-

* Compare Theol. Repos. vol. iv. p. 166---169.

jah and Son of Man incompatible in the same person. Matt. xvii. 12. Mark ix. 12.

That Jesus imagined the kingdom of heaven would be set up soon after his resurrection, is probable from several instances. Matt. xxvi. 29, he says, 'I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, till I drink it *new with you* in my Father's kingdom,' which would give the hearers reason to expect that the establishment of that kingdom would not be long delayed. The same may be thought probable from John xxi. 22. If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee.' John xiv. 3. 'And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you to myself.' Ver. 28. 'Ye have heard how I said, I go away, and come again to you.'—Compare this with 1 Thess. iv. 17. where the apostle evidently supposes that some of his contemporaries *might* be alive at the coming of Christ. Again, Apoc. i. 7. 'Behold he cometh with clouds: and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him,' the obvious meaning of which is, those individuals at whose instigation he was condemned and executed, should be alive to see him when his fortunes were reversed. Matthew xxvi. 64. Jesus addresses the chief priests and elders, 'Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.' Luke xxiii. 43. 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' This answer was intended to convey to the thief an idea that his request was granted, as the happiness under the reign of the Messiah corresponds in many particulars with the

the paradisiacal state. See Taylor, *Apostacy*, i. p. 203. and the expression *This day*, is accounted for by supposing that Jesus imagined his kingdom would in no long time be erected. Again, Matt. xvi. 27. it is said, 'There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.' Upon which I would just observe, that it seems little better than trifling in the learned Mr. Taylor, (*Apost.* i. p. 177.) to distinguish between Christ's coming in his own kingdom, at his second parousia; and his coming in his Father's at his transfiguration. The arrival of God's kingdom, the arrival of Christ's kingdom, the coming of the Son of Man in glory, in the clouds of heaven, are only different descriptions of the same event, to which his first parousia was preparatory, and which he imagined would almost immediately precede it. This is the kingdom foretold by Daniel, to be set up during the reign of the beasts, the same which is to be extended under Christ, as king over all. Of this more hereafter.

As the coming of the Son of Man in scripture refers only to one event, I might strengthen my hypothesis by Matt. x. 23. 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come.' But I am of opinion that *τελεσθῆναι τὰς πόλεις* ought be rendered, 'Ye shall not have perfected, initiated, converted to the gospel, the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man come,' which appears to be accurately true at present. But the principal text occurs, Matt.

xxiv. 34. Mark xiii. 30. Luke xxi. 32. 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things are fulfilled:' including the coming of the son of man.

It will be necessary to consider the whole of this 24th chapter of Matthew at some length; as it has been thought unfavourable to the hypothesis I have adopted by Mr. Taylor, *Apost. i. p. 50.*

Mat. xxiv. ver. 1, 2. Upon being shewn the buildings of the temple, our Lord foretels its destruction. 3. The disciples ask him when these things, the desolation of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the temple, shall come to pass; and what shall be the sign of his coming, and of the end of the world, or age. Events, which by their manner of asking, they appear to have thought synchronous, or at least immediately successive one to another.

Compare the account the different evangelists give of the question.

Matthew.
When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, *ἡ παρουσία*, and of the end of the age? *συνέλευσις τοῦ αἰῶνος*;

Mark xiii. 4.
When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign, when all these things shall be fulfilled? *ὅταν μὲν ταῦτα πάντα συνελθῶσι*;

Luke xxi. 7.
When shall these things be? and what sign will there be, when these things come to pass? *ὅταν μὲν ταῦτα γενέσθαι*;

And as from Matthew's account of the question, compared with that of the other two, it should seem that the disciples enquired only after one event, under three different modes of description;
or

or supposed that the three events were closely connected in point of time; so it will appear from our Lord's answer, that he also was of that opinion. [Compare the several parts of the question with ver. 14. 30. 34; whence it will appear that Christ does not answer them as separate interrogatories.] He begins, with cautioning them against the appearance of false Christs, ver. 4, 5. He apprises them of wars; of the rising of kingdom against kingdom, and nation against nation; of famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places, 6, 7, 8. He predicts the persecutions some were to suffer; the lukewarmness of others; and the seduction of many (9—13.) and tells them that the gospel shall be preached in all the world, *οικουμενη*. and then cometh the end, *το τέλος*, corresponding to *συνελεια τε αιωνος*. The event of preaching the gospel in all the world, was in a great measure accomplished before the destruction of Jerusalem. Ancient Test. vol. i. ch. 3. p. 50. *οικουμενη* signifies *the Roman Empire*, see Theol. Repository, iii. 317, in a note that belongs to the word WORLD, line 20, pag. 318, and should have been printed in the margin of that page.

He advises them, when they see the Roman army at Jerusalem, to beware, and act accordingly, 15—28. He proceeds, ver. 29, '*Immediately after* the tribulation of those days (those days in which it will be necessary for them which are *in Judea* to flee to the mountains, and to pray that their flight be not *on the Sabbath*; circumstances which bring us unavoidably to the siege of Jerusalem by Titus) the sun shall be darkened, &c.' i. e. the present political governments of the world shall

be overturned; ver. 30, 'And *then*,' at that time, immediately after the tribulation which is to begin with the siege of Jerusalem, 'shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven.'

It is impossible, for criticism to demonstrate that our Lord did not apprehend his coming might possibly be within a few years. And as for Mr. Taylor's remark, p. 54, 'that *τοτε* only regards the order of events, and not the distance of time,' it is very frequently contradicted in this chapter; and is used where it must mean, *at that time of which we have been speaking*;* and not, like *εἰτα*, or *επειτα*, denote a succession of events: See ver. 9, 10. 16. 21. 23. 40. In one part of the discourse, it refers to *δαν*, ver. 15. Had our Lord said, his coming would be *after* the desolation, at some indeterminate period, the particle would hardly have been *τοτε* in all the accounts, Mark xiii. 26. Luke xxi. 27. it would have been in all, most probably, *μετα ταυτα*. Sensible, as it should seem, of these difficulties, Dr. Hammond, on Mat. iii. note c; on xvi. note o; on xxiv. note b; supposes that the coming of Christ is one of those phrases that signifies the destruction of the Jewish polity. But Mr. Taylor, as I apprehend justly, looks upon this as a mistake; and regards the middle parousia, as no scripture doctrine, p. 170. B. Mord. i. 541.

V. 30. 'And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with great glory. Ver. 31. And he shall send his angels with a great

* OI TOTE, persons living at that time. Herodian. L. iii. § 26.

found of a trumpet' (the same event probably that is mentioned, 1 Cor. xv. 52. Apoc. xi. 15.) and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.' Comp. Rom. xi. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 23. 51. 1 Thess. iv. 15. Apoc. xx. 4.—ver. 32. 'Now learn a parable of the fig-tree: When its branch is yet tender, and puts forth leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh. 33. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that (not IT, but) HE, the son of man, the antecedent mentioned ver. 30, 31. is near, even at the doors. Compare 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Phil. iv. 5. James v. 8, 9. Ver. 34. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till *all these things* be fulfilled. 35. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away.'

It is impossible not to include the appearance of the sign of the son of man in heaven, in the *ταύλα μαύρα*, ver. 34. and if we could exclude that circumstance, we are expressly told, that when the events above-mentioned take place, the son of man will be at the door, ver. 33. In like manner Luke xxi. 28. 'And when these things *begin to come to pass*, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh!' which was to be the effect of what is said in the preceding verse, 'Then shall they see the son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory.' Again, ver. 31. 'So likewise ye, when ye see all these things come to pass, know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.' From comparing this verse with Mat. xxiv. 33. we learn that the establishment of the kingdom of God, is synonymous to the coming

coming of the son of man. It must not be concealed that Mr. Mede (Works, p. 752) interprets *yevea*, ver 34. to signify, not *an age*, but *a nation*; and maintains that here it denotes, that the Jewish nation should not perish till all these things were fulfilled. But why should not the word be taken in its usual sense; as in that signification it contains a plain answer to the question of the disciples; but if it be interpreted of the Jewish nation, it conveys no answer at all? 'The nation of the Jews shall not perish till all these things are fulfilled.' What answer is this to the enquiry of the disciples, 'when shall these things be?' Ver. 33, our saviour intimates that some of the disciples should live to see the signs and forerunners of his coming. Now what connexion has the continuance of the Jewish people, with the disciples seeing the signs and forerunners of that event? See Dr. Benson's essay *concerning the unity of sense*, prefixed to his paraphrase, and reprinted in Bishop Watson's tracts, iv. 500.

We have now seen our Lord's answer to the threefold question of the disciples. *Quest.* When will *these things* be? *Ans.* This generation shall not pass away till all *these things* be fulfilled, ver. 34. *Quest.* What shall be the sign of thy coming? *Ans.* Immediately after the tribulation, which shall commence with the siege of Jerusalem, the sun shall be darkened, and then shall appear the sign of the son of man. *Quest.* What shall be the sign of the end of the age? *Ans.* The gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world (which was in a great degree accomplished about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem) and then shall the end come. ver. 14.

In all these answers our Lord refers nearly to one period, and does not appear to arrange them as separate interrogatories, belonging to very different seasons.

Ver. 36. ' But of that day and that hour knoweth no man: no not the angels of heaven (neither the son. *Mark.*) but my Father only.' Concerning that particular day and hour, in which the son of man shall come, God alone knoweth it, so as to be able accurately to define it. It is a more ingenious than solid observation of Grotius and Lucas Brugenfis, that ταῦτα, ver. 34, and ΕΚΕΙΝΗΣ, in this verse, are used as opposites. For as the times our Lord is conversing about are all along entitled *ἡμεραι αὐτεῖναι*, ver. 19. 22. 29. it would be arbitrary to suppose that the time pointed out by *that day*, *ἡμεραι ἐκεῖναι*, was not a portion of *those days*, *ἡμεραι ἐκεῖναι*. We have moreover remarked, that *all these things* must include the coming of the son of man; so that there cannot possibly be any such opposition as these critics imagined. Nor is it in the least a contradiction that Christ should say, ' All these things shall happen before the death of the present generation;' when at the same time he affirms that concerning the particular day and hour of his own coming he was entirely ignorant. If the opposition between ταῦτα and ΕΚΕΙΝΗΣ appear to be necessary in this place, I refer the reader to Luke xxi. 22, 23. *ἡμεραι ἐκδικήσεως ΑΥΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΙ—και δε ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις ἐν ΕΚΕΙΝΑΙΣ ταῖς ἡμεραις*, evidently meaning the same period. *ὁλος αἰωνος, this is he.* Lucian. Somn. i. 16. Reitz.

What

What follows, 37—51, contains an assurance that the coming of the son of man would be *sudden*, and a consequent exhortation to watchfulness. Whence it is evident, that for any thing our Lord said, and, we may presume, for any thing he knew, the period of his advent might arrive in a very short time; even during the lives of many of his hearers; for the injunctions to vigilance would have been in a great measure unnecessary, had he been certain that none of those servants to whom he was speaking would be alive at the hour of their master's coming. So far from accurate is the remark of Mr. Taylor, p. 171, that our Lord repeatedly declared he was not to be expected at the time of the siege of Jerusalem. All we learn is, that he cautioned his hearers not to be deceived, and imagine he was arrived, till they saw him: for his advent would be no secret, but an affair of as public notoriety, as the lightning from one end of heaven to the other; he by no means asserts that he should not come during the siege of Jerusalem. Hence we evidently see the foundation of that apprehension, otherwise unaccountable, concerning the speedy approach of the day of the Lord, so frequently alluded to in the epistles. 1 Cor. i. 7, 8. Phil. iv. 5. iii. 20. 2 Thess. ii. 2. James v. 8, 9. 1 Pet. iv. 7. The revelation communicated to Jesus was not distinct on this subject; to him was not pointed out the exact arrangement of events, and the duration of the intervals between them. The whole of what would be hereafter appeared to him as one confused

fused mass of general calamity, which would soon begin, in his own country, and be immediately followed by his coming in the clouds of heaven, to set up the kingdom of God. The like appears to have been the case with many prophets under the law. Occurrences which took up ages in accomplishing, seemed to them as the events of only a few years. See Theol. Repos. iv. 118. 209. To Peter, Paul, and John, a more accurate delineation of times and seasons was vouchsafed. They were favoured with several circumstances of the grand apostacy, and millennium; of which our Lord appears to have entertained no conception. Nor does he seem to have been perfectly master of the predictions of Daniel: if he had, he could not but have understood that the kingdom to be erected at the coming of the son of man, was not to be established till the Roman empire had passed from the Imperial, through the semi-imperial, to the pollarchical state, denoted by the toes of the image, and the ten horns of the beast; and till the dominion of the little horn, which was diverse from the first, and had subdued three kings, was ready to be taken away.

There are some things in Mr. Taylor's examination of this prophecy, Matt. xxiv. which remain to be considered.—P. 50, he tells us, that the expression ‘*All these things*, when first used in this discourse, Matt. xxiii. 36. has no antecedent expressed; which plainly shews it to be a known phrase, equivalent to these other expressions, *all things which are written; all these things that shall come to pass; that which is written;*

ten; which was perfectly well understood by the Jews to relate to the prophecy of Daniel, as these words are explained, Matt. xxiii. 38; and to mean the desolation.' But we cannot help observing that that discourse ends with the chapter: that *all these things*, in that place, alludes, not to the several punishments, but the sins of the Jews: 'That upon you may come *all the righteous blood* shed upon the earth,' &c. The guilt of *all these murders* shall lie at your door, and be visited upon you in your national capacity. The 24th chapter records a discourse which began some time after: and the first time the phrase *all these things* is used, it refers to the buildings of the temple, ver. 2. and when the disciples ask, 'When shall these things be?' they mean, 'When shall the buildings of the temple be destroyed?'

Again, when Mr. Taylor says, '*What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world,*' are fresh questions, not included in the foregoing; he appears to have had, as I have endeavoured to shew, different ideas from the disciples, and from Jesus; who answers, as if he thought the events to succeed each other at no great interval.

Our author appears to be mistaken in his representation of Matt. xxiv. 34. 'The words *all these things*,' says he, 'can only relate to the events, of which Christ had mentioned the previous signs; as appears by ver. 33; but no previous signs had been given of any other event besides the desolation.' No! the desolation itself was one of the signs, not that *it*, but that *HE, Christ*,
was

was at the doors; in answer to the question, *what is the sign of thy coming?* The paragraph begins, ver. 30. 'Then shall appear *the sign of the Son of Man in heaven.*' A little after, Mr. Taylor adds, sect. 13. 'That no signs of Christ's coming were to be given, appears from ver. 38, 39. 42. 44. Luke xxi. 35, &c.' But these texts only caution the disciples not to be led away by deceivers; for the coming of Christ would be so public, that they should want no one to inform them when it happened. Every thing predicted throughout this chapter, was intended as a *sign* of the approach of the Son of Man, or the kingdom of God.

Mr. Taylor asserts, that the words *all these things* could not, ver. 34. include the coming of Christ, because Christ had told them, through the whole chapter, that the desolation would not happen at the time of his second coming: viz. that the desolation would be immediately after the tribulation of those days; but his parousia would not be till after the days of vengeance, and according to Luke, xxi. 22—24 after the dominion of the gentiles should be ended; which dominion still continues.' To this paragraph may be replied, 1st. It appears, from ver. 30, that the son of man would come at the time immediately subsequent to the great tribulation. And if we read the parable recorded by Luke, xix. 11—27. we shall see reason to conclude that Jesus did not know but that his coming might be even before the destruction of Jerusalem. 'A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and return—but his

his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. And it came to pass, that when he was returned, after having received the kingdom—he said—those mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither, and slay them before me.’ Who would argue, after reading this passage, that Christ would not be present, in his regal capacity, at the destruction of Jerusalem*? 2dly. The tribulation mentioned by Matthew, and the days of vengeance foretold by Luke, appear to be the same. 3dly. Our Lord’s saying that Jerusalem should be trodden under foot till the times of the gentiles are fulfilled, does not prove that he was apprized how long the desolation should continue; and that it could not be accomplished during the life of his contemporaries. There is an instance, in the Jewish history, of a most formidable desolation, inflicted by Antiochus, that lasted only three years and an half. Our Lord was ignorant of the exact termination of the dominion of the gentiles, as well as of the precise period of his own advent. 4thly. When our author says, that *all these things* could not include the coming of Christ, because Christ had told them

* Should it be argued from this parable, that one of the comings of Christ is represented in scripture as happening at the destruction of Jerusalem; I answer, that the nobleman, upon his return, calls for the accounts of his *servants*, who are distinguished from his *fellow-citizens*. The parousia therefore here alluded to, must be that in which he will hereafter come with the clouds; to reward, ver. 16. 19; and punish, ver. 20; and the parable gives no countenance to the hypothesis, that the destruction of Jerusalem is represented in scripture under the title of a *middle parousia* of Christ.

that

that his parousia would not be till after the dominion of the gentiles, which still continues, should be ended; he evidently begs the question, and supposes our Lord incapable of mistake in this particular. The event does not accurately correspond with Christ's declaration; therefore, as he argues, Christ never made it. The same answer must be given to two other paragraphs, in which Mr. Taylor asserts that our Lord could not predict his second coming to be during the then current generation; because it is a contradiction to all that is prophesied to come to pass in the latter ages of the world; and because the desolation being past, the parousia is not yet come.

The last objection I shall mention, is this; "If the coming of Christ, and the end of the world, were both implied in the phrase *all these things*, what could our Saviour mean by saying, 'Watch and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, Luke xxi. 36. and to stand before the son of man?' were they to watch and pray that they might escape the coming of the son of man, and the end of the world?" By no means! Any one who was not bent upon the support of an hypothesis, would easily be directed by the sense of the passage to confine *all things*, in this place, to what the disciples would be desirous of avoiding, the calamities that were threatened; especially, as the motive inducing them to watch, is expressly said to be, that they might stand before, and not avoid, the son of man. No such limitation of the phrase

VOL. VI.

M

occurs

occurs from the sense of the passage, Luke xxi. 32. Matt. xxiv. 34.

To return then from this long, but truly important digression, we find it very evident that our Lord is recorded by his historians, Matthew, Mark (xlii. 30.) and Luke, to have declared that his second coming was one of those events which would happen during the lives of some of his contemporaries. We find ourselves obliged to make this concession; and let Mr. Gibbon, the adversary whom Mr. Taylor has taken such laudable, if not * successful, pains in opposing, make every advantage of it that he can. Our Lord, if his conversation be accurately represented, has fallen into an inconsiderable mistake, in limiting the time of the then current generation, for the accomplishment of a series of prophecies not yet fulfilled; when at the same time he acknowledged to his hearers, that the particular day and hour in which one material occurrence was to come to pass, was concealed in the bosom of his Father; and consequently, not within his commission to declare. To Arians and Athanasians this cannot but be a revolting consideration. But to those who have learned that Jesus, like the other prophets, possessed no natural abilities superior to his fellow-creatures, it cannot seem wonderful that he should be capable of error, where he owns he was not directed by the spirit of God.

* *Not successful*, I mean, only with respect to this point.

Thus

Thus have I endeavoured to shew that John the Baptist by no means corresponds with the Elijah, whose history is recorded in the books of Kings; or with the person under that name, predicted by Malachi: and that our Lord's mistake on this subject arose from his knowing himself to be the Messiah, and from his supposing that his forerunner must of necessity be the Elias foretold; as John was the only prophet likely to be sent between the time of Malachi, and the great day of Jehovah, which he imagined to be near at hand. Who then, it may be asked, appears to have been that Elias? Is he yet arrived? I will presume to venture my opinion, which I hold not with any degree of confidence, but propose for the discussion of men who are able to inform me better, that the Elijah foretold by Malachi was no other than Jesus himself.

Let us remark what similarity there is in their respective histories. Elijah is recorded to have performed many beneficent miracles, such as feeding the starving widow and her son, and raising that son from the dead. And does not this remind us of our Lord's feeding the five thousand with five barley loaves and two small fishes, and of his re-animating the son of the widow of Nain? If it be said that Elisha did so likewise, I answer, that he did it by the spirit of Elijah, who is thus represented as the principal, acting by his successor. Should it be urged, that Jesus cannot be the antitype of Elijah, because he far exceeded him in miraculous works, I reply, the same objection lies against his being a prophet like unto Moses, whose su-

perior he undoubtedly was, Heb. iii. 3. 6. *Elijah* went a day's journey into the wilderness, where he was fed by an angel; and went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights. Thus Christ fasted forty days and forty nights in the wilderness, and was with wild beasts, and angels ministered unto him. Matt. iv. Mark i. The great objects of *Elijah's* mission appear to be establishing the unity and supremacy of God, and overthrowing idolatry. And what were the ideas of Jesus, when he beheld Satan, like lightning, fall from heaven? when he declared he built a church, against which the gates of Hades should not be able to hold out*; when he exerted his power against the imaginary beings, the objects of pagan worship, and ejected them from the bodies of the demoniacs they were supposed to possess? Will he not act in conformity to *Elijah*, when he shall hereafter purge his church of its idolatrous corruptions? And if the explanation *Christophilos* has given of baptizing with the Holy Spirit, and baptizing with fire, be admitted (*Theol. Reposit.* vol. iv. 360. 464.) if these phrases denote *the visiting with favour*, by the performance of beneficent miracles, and *the visiting with calamity*, we have the Baptist's testimony, that the characters intimately

* *Hades* seems here to mean the residence of departed spirits, their fortified city; whose gates should not be able to hold out against the church, the congregation of Christ, assailing them. These words then appear to contain a prophecy, not that Satan should be unable, with all his strength and all his artifices, to overthrow the church; but that, on the contrary, the church should begin the attack; and that the citadel of the idols should not be proof against the forces that lay before it.

correspond:

correspond : as we have already adverted to several beneficent miracles, wrought at the hand of Elijah ; and as he called down fire upon the messengers of Ahaziah, slew the prophets of Baal (compare Luke xii. 49. Apoc. xx. 9.) and denounced vengeance against Ahab, Jezebel, and Ahaziah, as Jesus did against the Jews. The question likewise proposed by James and John, does not weaken my position : ‘ Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, *even as Elias did* ?’ Which renders it probable the disciples had considered their master as bearing some resemblance to that prophet ; whether they had adopted the opinion from any suggestions of the Baptist, or from the prediction of Malachi. See Theol. Repos. vol. iv. 471.

When Elijah had finished his commission, he was taken up alive into heaven ; and empowered Elisha to work miracles in his stead. So Christ, after he had finished his commission, one part of which was to die, and afterwards shew himself alive from the dead, was received into heaven, and after his ascension, gave spiritual gifts to men.

If we look into the prophecies of Malachi, we shall find them as applicable to Jesus, as they are otherwise to the Baptist. Mal. iii. 1. ‘ Behold, I *will* send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me,’ is explained by, and relates to, the same event with chap. iv. 5. ‘ Behold, I *will* send unto you Elijah the prophet, before the great and terrible day of Jehovah come.’ Thus Christ has been sent al-

ready in his prophetic character, previous to the coming of that day, in which the power of Jehovah will be signally displayed. ‘And suddenly shall come to his palace the Lord whom ye seek.’ (for such is the order of the words in the original). This description is perfectly agreeable to the predictions of our Lord’s second coming, delivered in the gospel; that coming, in his regal capacity, which the Jews have ardently desired, ever since the time, and upon the credit of Daniel,—‘Even the messenger of the covenant.’ This clause appears to me to warrant a conclusion, that the messenger who should prepare the way before Jehovah, *i. e.* Elijah the prophet, who should be sent before the great and terrible day of Jehovah, was to be the same person with the Lord who should come suddenly to his palace.—‘The great and terrible day of Jehovah,’ iv. 5. is described, ver. 1. 3. ‘For behold the day cometh which shall burn as a furnace; and all the proud, and all that do wickedness shall be as stubble. And the day which cometh shall burn them up, saith Jehovah, God of Hosts: for it shall not leave them root or branch. But unto you that fear my name, shall the son of righteousness arise, with healing in his wings. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be as dust under the soles of your feet, in the day which I shall appoint, saith Jehovah, God of Hosts.’ This appears parallel to the description given, chap. iii. 1—6. ‘Behold he shall come, saith Jehovah, God of Hosts; but who shall abide the day of his coming; and who shall stand when he

‘ he appeareth ? For he is like the fire of a refiner, and like the soap of fullers. And he shall sit, as a refiner and purifier of silver ; and he shall purify the sons of Levi ; and shall refine them as gold, and as silver. And they shall bring near unto Jehovah an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasing unto Jehovah, as in the days of old, as in former years. And I will draw near unto you to judgment ; and I will be a swift witness against forcerers, and against adulterers, and against false-swearers ; and against those who oppress the hireling in his hire, and the widow, and the fatherless ; and who turn aside the poor, and fear not me, saith Jehovah, God of Hosts. For I am Jehovah your God ; I change not : therefore ye, the sons of Jacob, are not consumed.’ Compare Apoc. xi. 17. xiv, 19, 20. xviii. 9. 23, 24. xxi. 8.

We may remark, by the way, that by the messenger who was to prepare the way before Jehovah, and by Elijah the prophet, our Lord undoubtedly understood the same person ; as he refers both the prophecies to John ; Matt. xi. 10. compared with ver. 14. We may observe also, that any person, reading these prophecies, would not be led to imagine any great interval between the mission of Jehovah’s harbinger, or Elijah the prophet ; and the coming of the Lord to his palace, or, the day of Jehovah ; but rather the contrary. We need not then be surprized that Jesus, persuaded that Elias was come already, should not hesitate to pronounce his own

second advent would happen before the generation, at that time upon earth, should pass away.

The latter prophecy, Mal. iv. 4. is thus introduced; ‘Remember ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb, concerning all Israel; even the statutes and the judgments. Behold, I will send unto Elijah the prophet.’—It is introduced, I say, as if the institutes of Moses were to be in force no longer than till the coming of Elijah; and would be then superseded. There is an evident opposition between the two personages. And this is rendered more probable by mention having been made in the preceding prophecy (iii. 1.) of the arrival of a messenger of a *covenant*, which was undoubtedly a new one, to take place of the Mosaic. It is possible that this is the light in which Jesus understood the prediction, when, perhaps in reference to it, he said, Matt. xi. 13. ‘All the prophets, and the law prophesied until John [and no longer] And [or, *For*] if ye will receive *him*, this is the Elias that was for to come [and terminate the old dispensation].’ With respect to the meaning of the prophecy, it makes no difference whether Jesus was right in the person to whom he applied it. Yet the circumstance affords a strong presumption, that this Elijah should be a prophet like unto Moses; should be the messenger of a new covenant; should be what we behold in Jesus Christ.

It follows, ver. 6. ‘That he may convert the heart of the fathers, together with the children; and the heart of the children together with their fathers, lest I come and smite the land (or *the whole*)

‘*whole earth, or the city*; for one MS. No. 228, ‘reads *העיר* (the city) with utter destruction.’ Such was the purpose of our Lord’s mission. Had the Jews (referring *the land, or the city*, to Judea or Jerusalem) believed in him, their destruction, as a people, would have been prevented: and notwithstanding their overthrow, their christian countrymen were delivered. Lardner’s Ancient Testimonies, vol. i. p. 75, 76. 131. Commentaries and Essays, vol. i. p. 210. Thus likewise it will be, when he shall purge his church. His true disciples will be admitted to the happiness of the millenium, and his adversaries destroyed. Comp. Apoc. xiv. 3—5. 9, 10. xviii. 9. 23, 24. xxi. 2. 8. And thus Christ’s ministry will be interposed, that the whole earth may not be visited with a curse. If we translate the Hebrew as the LXX. have done, in the sense of Elijah’s bringing about *a restoration*, we know that Jesus will introduce the paradisiacal state foretold, Apoc. xxii. 2, 3. 14. ii. 7. (See Taylor on Apostacy, i. 201.) which seems to be the *αποκαταστασις*, mentioned Acts iii. 21. as the period of Christ’s residence in heaven, before his coming in the clouds,

I will just mention an observation of Le Clerc, (Supplement to Hammond, Luke i. 17.) especially as it agrees with the established translation. He renders, ver. 6. ‘He shall convert the hearts of the fathers, *by*, to the children;’ and says, the passage signifies that the prophet should call those who were at variance among themselves to agreement and concord. He opposes the place to Matt. x. 35. ‘I am come to set a man *against* his

his father, &c.*' Were this the true meaning of the passage, it would well suit with the reconciliation of the differences that have distracted the christian world, on religious subjects, which we see now effecting; and trust will be completed, by the recovery of the genuine gospel.— This interpretation, however, makes it impossible to apply the prophecy to John; for he can in no sense be said to have extinguished animosities, and established concord, in his public character.

But a circumstance which at present weighs much with me is what passed at the transfiguration. A writer, *Theol. Repos.* vol. ii. p. 122, has mentioned three purposes this transaction was calculated to serve; viz. to confirm the faith of the three leading disciples who were witnesses of it in the divine authority of Jesus: to confirm to them, and others, who should hear their preaching, the certainty of Jesus's declarations, concerning the glory with which God would invest him, in recompence for his obedience: and to exhibit a striking evidence, that Jesus is indeed the person of whom the prophets spake; and give assurance of the accomplishment of what they had predicted concerning him. To these I think he might have added a fourth, which to me appears a principal intention. I conceive the vision to have been premonitory to Jesus himself; and to have been vouchsafed as an encouragement to him to undergo his fiery trial. It was exhibited as an example of what

* See Micah vii. 6.

those

those who had before filled the high prophetic office, were now arrived at; and might operate as an earnest of his own glorification. The very imperfect account the evangelists have left us of the conversation which passed on the occasion, is a proof that the glorified prophets spake to Jesus, more than to the three disciples; and were entrusted on an embassy of instruction to him in particular. The small intimation preserved by Luke of the topic of their discourse, is, that they announced to him his decease. chap. ix. 31. The word is *ekodos*, his *exit*; which may refer to his departure out of life at the crucifixion; his egress from the grave; or the final leave he took of the world, at his ascension. Any one of these topics may be supposed to have employed the attention of these celestial messengers, to prepare him for the important part he was to perform.

Now according to my hypothesis, there was peculiar propriety in the selection of the personages that now made their appearance.—Our Lord resembled Moses, as the mediator of a new covenant, and in other particulars acknowledged by divines. And if he was the Elias which was to come, we need not ask why Elias was now presented to him. As he resembled them both on earth, it would be natural for him to conclude he should resemble them both hereafter: and as he had been employed on a similar commission, he should be partaker likewise of their glory. Nor can I perceive any other reason for introducing Elias into this scene. The reader will on this occasion recollect what was observed above, relating to the mention of Moses,
and

and the immediate transition to the future *Elijah*, Malachi iv. 4, 5.

But here a formidable objection occurs. 'If *Elias*, it may be urged, presented himself to *Jesus*, as a similar character, and an earnest of his glorification; is it conceivable that *Jesus* should immediately afterwards have been guilty of a mistake; should have been ignorant that himself was the *Elias* which was to come; and persuaded that *John* was that expected prophet? On this supposition, the embassy had failed, in part at least, of its design.' I allow the strength of the objection; and offer what I have to say, as an enquirer after truth, and not as having attained it. We know the opinion of *Jesus* concerning *John* at a prior period. And convinced as I am of the simple humanity of *Christ*, and having learned to question his absolute infallibility, with respect to subjects not immediately connected with his mission (See *Repos.* iv. 435—461.) I think it probable that he might not, all of a sudden, on the mere sight of *Elias*, lay aside the idea he had adopted; and perceive, that as one of the prophets was connected with him by a similitude of office, so must the other be likewise. His thoughts were taken up by the prospect of the future glories, which, he was now convinced, by the example of those whom he knew at least to be *prophets*, would be the consequence of a due discharge of his ministry. The conversation that had passed was of too personal, and too interesting a nature, to lead him to the discovery of an error in so minute a particular; and it turned much more upon what was
to

to happen to him, than upon the resemblance he bore to those who stood before him, and the propriety with which the persons of this visionary scene were appointed. The question of the disciples was put to him before he had time to reflect upon the event, or deduce the obvious conclusions, which a short consideration would not have failed to suggest.

Bold, and novel, and unwarrantable as some of my positions may appear, I communicate them in full assurance that by these researches alone we can ever hope to delineate the real character of our Lord and Master. That character must be ascertained from facts: from his behaviour upon all occasions; and from his discourses, understood in their plain and obvious meaning, and not tortured and misrepresented according to our preconceived opinions of the speaker's inspiration and infallibility. I communicate my sentiments with the fullest confidence that I am by no means injuring the cause of genuine christianity; but on the contrary, resting it upon its only firm and proper basis, the power of God. Whatever we detract from the natural ability of the instruments employed in the propagation of the gospel, we increase, in the same proportion, the probability of a divine interference, in the accomplishment of the grand design. And if not only the apostles, but their master, be found to have fallen into some obvious, though trivial mistakes, the less appearance is there of their having concerted and executed the plan, by their human wisdom, and unassisted policy. The events of this world accord
with

with the declarations of the prophets; while at the same time, an accurate observer may trace some unimportant circumstances, which demonstrate that neither he who uttered, nor he who fulfilled the prediction, was so far instructed in it, as to have contributed by his own endeavours to its completion. Here then, was the finger of God. Investigations of this kind will never overthrow the faith of a rational believer: they will withdraw his attention and confidence from the instruments, in the hand of providence, whom ignorance, superstition, and apostacy have deified; and refer him solely and entirely to that Being, to whom the first preachers of the gospel have invariably directed him; to that Being who is the only potentate; who alone is good, alone is wise; who is their Father, and our Father, their God, and our God.

The only correction which my sentiments, if admitted, will make necessary in the excellent Essay of Christophilus, is this; 'that he must suppose John in the right, when he maintains that he was neither Elias, nor that prophet, and impute the whole mistake to Jesus, in declaring that he was.' And if the worthy Pamphilus be still of opinion that 'there can be no doubt of Christ's being supernaturally informed, that John the Baptist was his forerunner, in the character of Elias' (Theol. Repos. iv. 441.) he will give himself the trouble of refuting my fallacious reasonings, and correcting my present persuasion.

I D I O T A.

*Observations on some Articles in the preceding
Parts of this Work.*

I. Vol. iv. p. 227.

IF Nepiodidasalos would consult the reading of the Cant. MS. in Mark iii. 21. he would find the text restored beyond all possibility of doubt, and that his criticism on the word *etiam* is needless. An admirer of Nepiodidasalos hopes he may without offence suggest the necessity of paying strict attention to the text, before he begins to translate it. Many a wearisome criticism would be spared. If he have not time to weigh the value of the different readings, he will find it done in a great measure to his hands, in Dr. Harwood's edition of the Gr. Text. which, barring some hundreds of typographical errors, is the purest text, I apprehend, the christian world ever saw. As one great proof of its merit, every reading which he has adopted, is almost to a particle the same which that sagacious critic, Zachary Pearce, adopted afterwards. And I believe they were mutually ignorant of each others labours. Let the reader only compare Harwood's text with that which the Bishop reads in his translation of the first epistle to the Corinthians.

II.

Vol. v. p. 177.—As some proof of the hypothesis of Anglo-Scotus, and the idolatry of the
Ante-

Antediluvians, Tertullian (c. iv. de Idol.) states from the apocryphal book of Enoch (which Peter, 2d epist. c. ii. probably quotes) that in the time of that favourite of heaven, the apostacy from the true religion had descended so low as the setting up of idols, and that he foretold all the abominations which succeeded, in esteeming the elements, and all the substances found in the air, in the sea, and upon the earth, as objects of worship, instead of Jehovah.

III.

Vol. v. p. 441.—Surely the vision in Acts x. entirely respects eatables. Things unclean to a Jew were shewn to Peter, and he was commanded to eat. Without this permission, how could he travel three days with heathens, and eat and drink with them, x. 30? How could he live at a heathen's house (verse 48) where he must necessarily be compelled to eat of unclean things? That he did do so, appears from xi. 13. Or how, indeed, could the gospel be propagated among the gentiles at all, if the apostles were not permitted to abide with, and consequently eat and drink with them?

That Peter at the first should doubt of the meaning of the vision, or that he should mistake it when at Cornelius's, x. 48. is not surprising. Yet his conduct at Antioch, in promiscuously eating with the gentiles, shews that he afterwards understood it aright. For Paul does not blame him for thus eating with the gentiles, but only for temporising through fear of the circumcision. Hermas, I presume, will not deny that the apostles were to use their reason, and that full scope was given for it, in the revelations vouchsafed to them.

IV.

Vol. v. p. 310.—The great objection of Pamphilus to Christ's reigning upon earth, is his declaration, that his kingdom is not of this world. But it should be remembered, that this is given us by an apostle who seldom, if ever, uses *κοσμος*, for the material world, but for wicked men. And when the four wicked cruel monarchies shall be dissolved, and the saints shall possess the kingdom, and set up a kingdom of righteousness, it may be doubted then, whether in John's sense of the word it will be a kingdom *ἐκ τῆς κοσμοῦ τῆς*. Then the kingdoms of *this world* will become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.

Christ promises the thief that he shall be with him in paradise; Ezekiel and the book of Revelation speak of the same state as the reward of the virtuous. Paradise, I presume, must be on earth, not in heaven. Many of his promises are incompatible with a state elsewhere. Matt. v. 5. Luke xxii. 30. Matt. xxvi. 29. Rev. v. 10.

It is remarkable that the happiness of the Jews is spoken of in the same language, and the same figures, as that of christians, in the Revelation and in the prophets.

The same time is fixed for both, namely, when the fourth monarchy shall be dissolved; and the times of the gentiles be fulfilled.

Both too are to be preceded by the same distress, Luke xxi. 25—29. Matt. xxiv. 29. But what puts the time beyond all doubt, is, that Zech. xii. says, the Jews in their prosperous state shall see Christ, and shall mourn for having crucified him. Now christians are always taught to expect their

Vol. VI.

N

blessed-

bleſſedneſs, *ἡ τὴν νάμωσιν* at the coming, at the revelation, at the appearing of Chriſt, when the eminently virtuous will partake of the firſt reſurrection. Rev. xx.

If any tranſactions in the goſpels were thus ſimilar in language, circumſtances, and thus defined by time, though ſome circumſtances ſhould appear diſſimilar and hard to be accounted for, yet would Pamphilus have the leaſt ſcruple to look upon them as one and the ſame?

With what conſiſtency can Ebionita retain the firſt four verſes of Luke's goſpel, and reject all the reſt of the two chapters, eſpecially when Marcion's goſpel began at the third chapter?

ANGLO-SCOTUS.

*An Attempt to aſcertain the Meaning of
ἡ βαρτολογίη, uſe not vain Repetitions, in
Matt. vi. 7.*

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

I HAVE always been of opinion from the context, that this word is very wrongly rendered by the phraſe—uſe not vain repetitions. And it would, I apprehend, be of no ſmall importance to the cauſe of religion, to be able to aſcertain the
precise

precise meaning of this word, as many, even of the learned, I perceive, are influenced in their opinion of prayer, from the common acceptation of the word in this place. From the authority which he thought this passage gave him, a worthy and able critic just deceased, proposed in his Review, that the Lord's prayer should never be used in the public service of the church of England above once. And many, merely from this reputed sanction of holy writ, object to the repetition of this or any other prayer. Dr. Harwood's paraphrase of this verse, in his liberal translation is, Think not the design of prayer is by the dint of importunity to tease the Deity into a compliance with our requests. Mr. Paley has the same expression in his Moral and Political Philosophy. Others of the learned that I could mention, convey the same sentiment, though not in such offensive language. Indeed it appears to me to border upon prophane-ness, and to be infinitely more improper than the advice of the old heathen to his wife, not to deafen the gods with her thanks because she had found her daughter.

Isaiah had a different idea of this matter when he said,

For Sion's sake I will not keep silence, and for the sake of Jerusalem I will not rest until her righteousness break forth as a strong light, and her salvation like a blazing torch.

Ch. lxii. Lowth.

The word βαλλω (if I mistake not) is not to be found in any author sacred or prophane, nearly contemporary with the Evangelists. And as Matthew wrote in hebrew, it is impossible to say what

was the original word, for which the translator substituted this barbarous one. The only clue, therefore, to guide us to the meaning of it is the context, and the explanation of early times. But before I endeavour to shew what it does mean, I shall attempt to shew what it does not.

When ye pray, says our translation, use not vain repetitions. But what are vain repetitions? Is repeating the same request, in the same or similar words, a vain repetition? Then our Lord was guilty of it, for he three times repeated the same request, in the same or similar words. O, Father, if it be thy will, &c. Matt. xxvi. 44.

Our Lord cannot mean by this word, use not repetitions in prayer, because in Luke xi. 2. where, according to the Cant. MS. the very same phrase occurs, *ὅταν προσευχῇς μὴ βαρτολογεῖς ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ*, he gives a parable of a man and his churlish neighbour, to enforce *the importunate repetition of our requests*. He represents the neighbour as influenced by nothing but the importunate repetition of the same request. "I say unto you, though he will not rise and give him because he is his friend, yet because of his *importunity* he will rise and give him as many as he needeth." And the inference he draws is, that we are to be equally importunate, and not to content ourselves with merely asking, but to seek, yea to knock. "And I say unto you, ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you."

Our Lord cannot mean by this word, use not repetition in prayer, because in Luke xviii. 1. he spake a parable unto them, unto this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint.

And to inculcate the frequency and continuance of prayer, he represents the unjust judge to be intirely influenced by the importunate repetition of this same request, *Avenge me of my adversary.*

This cannot be his meaning, because he himself whole nights *ἢ προσευχόμενος* was praying, Luke v. 16. His prayer, when he went up into a mountain to pray, Matt. xiv. appears to have lasted twelve hours. If, during these long prayers, he made a different request in every petition, he was guilty of the fault which he condemns, *πολυλογία*, much speaking. He did, therefore, at these times, the same as he did in his agony, repeatedly urge the same request.

The practice of the apostles and disciples, we find perfectly consonant to this example, Acts xii. 5. When Peter was kept in prison, prayer was made without ceasing by the church unto God *for him*. Nor was their praying ceased when Peter knocked at the door, v. 12. We have two instances then in scripture, which may be called facts, as opposed to theory and precept, of the importunate repetition of the same request being favourably accepted by the hearer of prayer. The one in the case of Christ, who was heard *ἀπο τῆς εὐλαβείας*, Heb. v. 7. for his piety; the other in that of Peter, who was delivered out of prison at the unceasing prayer of the church.

The apostle Paul made request without ceasing, that he might have a prosperous journey to see the Romish church, Rom. i. 9—11. He made the same request likewise, night and day, praying exceedingly that he might see the church of Thes-

salonica, Thes. iii. 10. Not to mention the perpetual injunctions to pray without ceasing, to continue in prayer, to continue instant in prayer; I think it therefore clear that our Lord could not mean to forbid in this passage what is the uniform object of his and the apostles' precepts and practice to enforce, viz. the importunate repetition of our requests.

Repetition is as agreeable too to reason as to scripture. Our prayers, we well know, can make no change on the unchangeable God. It is we who are changed, and this must be proportionable to the fervor, the frequency, and repetition of our prayers.

I am persuaded, that the reason why *βαττολογεω* is rendered to use vain repetitions is, on account of the word *πολυλογία*, critics taking these words to be nearly synonymous. But the *πολυλογία* of the ancient heathens seems to have consisted in this—that by enumerating a vast variety of particulars of their worldly wants to the proper gods, they should at least obtain something. Battology, it is clear from the passage, was something which the heathens were guilty of in their prayers, and Christ commands us not to imitate them for this reason—because God knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him. Surely this reason leads us to think that Christ is speaking of our worldly wants. If it be spoken of prayer in general, it seems rather an argument against any prayer at all, than against repetitions. But though it be no argument against repetitions, yet it is a very strong

strong one against our enumerating, like the heathens, a vast variety of particulars concerning our worldly wants.

From the 24th verse to the end, Christ resumes the subject of prayer. He tells them they cannot earnestly pursue after mammon, worldly riches, and God at the same time; and by a variety of arguments he exhorts them not to be solicitous about them. In verse 31, he draws this inference from what he has said. "Therefore take not anxious thought, saying, what shall we eat? or what shall we drink? or wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the gentiles seek." This, then, was the fault of heathens in prayer, the seeking after worldly things; and in verse 32, he gives this reason why we should not do the same, because our heavenly Father knoweth that we have need of all these things. But this he urges in verse 8, as the reason why we should not battologize. I conclude, therefore, that to battologize, and to pray for worldly things, are one and the same thing.

The same conclusion is drawn from the same premises in Luke xii. 29. in possibly stronger words.—"And seek ye not what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither live ye in careful suspense, for after all these things do the nations (*edyn*) of the world seek, and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things."

It will add strength to this argument, if the heathenish account of their own prayers corresponds with the accusation of our Lord. Now they tell us, that it was not customary with them

to pray for the virtues of the mind, but solely for temporal things, for a wife or child, and that these might be handsome, but above all for riches.

Prima fere vota, et cunctis notissima templis,
Divitiæ ut crescant; ut opes, ut maxima toto
Nostra sit arca foro. Juv. Sat. x. 23.

In order to gain these the better, Horace tells us they used to pray for drink.

Da mihi fallere, da justum sanctumque videri
Noctem peccatis, et fraudibus objice nubem.

Hor. Ep. xvi. 56.

Seneca says, Ep. 10. Nunc enim quanta dementia est hominum? Turpissima vota diis infusurrant, si quis admoverit aurem conticefunt, et quod scire hominem nolunt Deo narrant.

Should the explanation of the early christians agree with this above given, we should then have three arguments to make us conclude that bathology is praying like the heathens for worldly particulars. Origen, I believe, is the first who has given us an explanation of this word, and he lived early enough to have preserved the ancient traditionary one of the church. To what Dr. Whitby has already quoted, take the following.

Αλλά προσευχομένοι μη βαττολογησώμεν αλλά θεολογησώμεν. βαττολογώμεν δε οί μη μωμοσκοπηνίες εαυτες η τες αναπεμπόμενες της ευχης λογες, λεγωμεν τα διεφθαρμενα εργα, η λογες, η νοηματα ταπεινα τυγχανούνα, η επιληπτα, της αφθαρσιας αλλοτρια τε κυρια. — Βαττολογειν γαρ καλα την λεξιν τε ευαγγελικη, μοι οι εθνηκοι, εδε φαύλασιαν των μεγαλων εχόντες, η επεραντων αιτημάτων, πασαν ευχην των σωματικων, η της εκλος αναπεμπόντες. Εθνηκοι εν βαττολογειν ομοιζαι ο τα κατω απο τε εν θρανους και υπερ τα υψη των θρανων κατοικητος κυρις αιων. και εσκε γε ο πολυλογος βαττολογειν, και ο βαττολογων πολυλογειν.

“ But

“But when we pray, we do not battologize, but theologize. For we battologize when not duly considering the words of prayer which we utter, we make mention of those things which are scandalous to be done, or to be spoken, or to be thought of, things reprehensible, and far remote from the divine purity.”

“For according to the gospel, the *beatbens only* are guilty of battology, who having no conception of great and heavenly petitions, put up those only which concern the body and external things. He therefore resembles a heathen battologist, who asks low things of him who inhabiteth heaven and the heaven of heavens.— There is a resemblance also between a battologist and one who is guilty of much speaking.”
Orig. *περὶ εὐχῆς*, p. 67. Westen’s edit. Basil. 1674.

From, therefore, the early explanation of the christian church, from the accounts of the heathens themselves, and above all, from the context, I conclude, that battology signifies the enumerating many particulars concerning our worldly wants.

I would paraphrase the verse, therefore, in this manner.

But when ye pray, enumerate not a number of particulars concerning your worldly wants, as the heathens do, for they think that by asking for many things they shall at least obtain something. Be not ye therefore like unto them, for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him.

ANGLO-SCOTUS.

*An Attempt to illustrate the xxivth Chapter
of Matthew's Gospel.*

TO THE DIRECTORS OF THE THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

THE first person that I know of, who gave the right clue to understand this chapter, was the honest Mr. Whiston. He maintained that it did not concern one subject merely, the destruction of Jerusalem, but another, the second coming of Christ at the end of the world, for which opinion he is very illiberally treated by the *then orthodox* Dr. Whitby.

The late Mr. Taylor of Portsmouth, in his *Thoughts on the Nature of the Grand Apostacy*, Johnson—81. p. 49—56. and in his *Dissertation annexed to the Parousia of Christ*, p. 170—182. has adopted the same interpretation, and has cleared it of some difficulties, but has at the same time left others, as well as been guilty, in my opinion, of some mistakes, or I should not now trouble you with this.

Grotius contended that the disciples asked our Lord three questions in Matt. xxiv. 3. viz. When shall these things be? the first. What shall be the sign of thy coming? the second. And of the end of the world? the third.

But

But what Grotius makes the second and third is only one and the same question extended in other words, Christ never giving his followers any hopes that he would come before the end of the *aww*, age, christian dispensation, or world, or last day, when he would raise them up. Matt. xvi. 27. For the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels. *Then* shall he reward every man according to his works. Matt. xix. 28. Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, shall, in the regeneration, *when* the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, &c. Heb. ix. 28. To those that look for him without sin, shall he appear the *second* time unto salvation. See 1 Thess. i. 10, 11. 19. 2 Thess. i. 7. Col. iii. 4. 1 Pet. v. 4.

I apprehend it to be now a settled point, that the scriptures speak of but two comings of Christ, one in the reign of Tiberius, the other at the resurrection. Mr. Taylor has sufficiently scouted the idea of any coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem. To what he has said I will only remark, that Christ promised the Sanhedrim, that *they* should be witnesses of his coming. Matt. xxvi. 64. He says in verse 30, of the chapter I am upon, that all the tribes of the earth should *see* him. His angel tells John, Rev. i. 7. that *every eye* should see him. The angels likewise told the assembled disciples, that that same Jesus who was taken from them into heaven, should so come in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven. Acts i. 11. But none of these people did see him at the destruction of Jerusalem,
nor

nor did any one. And there is no more evidence of Christ having been personally present at the destruction of Jerusalem, than at the destruction of Lisbon, or the siege of Gibraltar. Certainly the author of Hebrews (see ch. ix. 28.) had no idea but of two comings of Christ, but I will not take up your valuable room to prove a thing already so demonstrated by others.

That the disciples propose but two, and not three questions, is evident from the parallel passage of Luke xxi. 7. which according to the reading of the Cant. MS. runs, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming?" which would harmonize with Matt. xxiv. 3. if we rendered *now*, *even*. When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, *even* of the end of the world. In Mark likewise there are but two questions asked, Mark xiii. 4. When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when *all* these things shall be fulfilled. Here is a distinction between these things, and *all* these things. The like phrase including that coming, he had just been speaking of in these words, Ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

Great part of the confusion in this chapter is owing to the impropriety of the apostles Peter, James, and John asking two questions at once, and to the courtesy of our Lord in endeavouring to answer both at once. In Mark the division between the two questions is much better preserved than in Matthew, and he, together with

with Luke, will enable us accurately to distinguish when Christ answers one question, and when the other.

I shall suppose then, the two questions in Matt. xxiv. 3. to be put in the words of Luke according to the reading of the Cant. MS. When shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming. When shall these things? What things? Certainly the woes he had just been denouncing through the twenty-third chapter, the vengeance of the righteous blood, which was to come upon that generation, with the destruction of the temple which he was at this very instant talking of, xxiv. 1—3. And this seems to me a much more easy and obvious interpretation than to say with Mr. Taylor, p. 51. that this was an expression well understood by the Jews of those days. For which he gives no sort of proof.

The questions then may be worded in this manner. When shall these woes and this destruction of the temple you threaten come to pass? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, mentioned in the preceding discourse. Matt. xxiii. 39?

From Matt. xxiv. 4. to 9. Jesus answers the last question, and not as Mr. Taylor supposes, the first. It cannot be said that before the destruction of Jerusalem, nation arose against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and that there were famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places, and fearful sights and great signs from heaven. It really makes one tremble for the cause of Christ, to see the miserable shifts

shifts expositors are put to, to make out this. But this they never can to the conviction of the enquiring, and it is absurd to attempt it, if the signs our Master is speaking of, do not relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, but to his second coming.

V. 8. These are the beginning of sorrows. i. e. these calamities which Dan. xiii. 1, 2. Luke xxi. 25, 26. and a variety of prophets have foretold should come upon the world at or about the coming of Christ. This verse parallels with verse 29, and by the bye, is only a quotation from 2 Esdras xvi. 17. a book which I apprehend our Master repeatedly quotes. See Matt. xxiii. 37, 38. and which he calls the wisdom of God, Luke xi. 49.

This verse refers to the same period as 2 Esdras xiii. 31—39.

Ver. 9. *Τότε παραδοσονται*—Then shall men deliver you; or as it is in Mark, shall deliver you up to councils, and in synagogues shall ye be beaten. *Then*. When? at the end of the world, at that beginning of sorrows, some thousand years after they have been dead? No. The whole obscurity arises from Matthew's *τοτε*, *then*, which Luke has avoided, accurately distinguishing the two questions, by saying *Προ δε τωτων απαντων*. But before all these things shall they deliver you, &c. and Mark by saying *βλεπετε δε υμεις εαυτους*. But take heed to yourselves.

In verse 15. our text reads *ουν*, therefore, as if it were a conclusion from what went before. But the true reading is *δε*, as one MS. and the Syriac version have it, and above all as Mark xiii.

14. reads it. But when ye shall see the abomination, &c.

From verse 9 to 22. relates entirely to the first question—when shall these woes be?

From verse 22 to 27. contains cautions against being deceived by the false christs, who would make their appearance at that period.

Verse 27. contains the strongest argument against the notion of any coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem: For he says that his coming shall be not only as sudden, but as public and visible as lightening. Whereas no eye saw him at the destruction of Jerusalem, but at this coming every eye is to see him.

From verse 29 to 32. relates entirely to the second question. What shall be the sign of thy coming. All the MS. and versions except the Perfic, acknowledge the word *αδεις* in this verse. It has created as much confusion as *τοτε* in the 9th verse. If it be genuine, it relates more to the order of events than to any distance of time, just as *ελλα* is used 1 Cor. xv. 24. though a distance of at least a thousand years is to intervene between Christ's second coming, and his delivery of the kingdom to the Father. Mark, however, has avoided this confusion of apparently running one question into another, by saying xiii. 24. *αλλα εν εσθιναις ταις ημεραις μελα την θρασιν ενεσθιν.* But in those days *after* that tribulation.

Now *εσθιναις ημεραις*, those days, the latter days, &c. are common expressions in the prophets to denote that very time the evangelist is now speaking of, namely, the distress of nations which is to take

take place about the second coming of Christ. See Joel ii. 29. 2 Esdras, xvi. 17. xiii. 31. 39.

Besides, in the parallel passage in Luke xxi. 25, 26, 27, the expressions are much too *general* as well as too strong, to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem only.

Again, from verse 29 to 32, cannot be applied to the destruction of Jerusalem, because if applied to it, it is not true that these things happened after that tribulation, but during it, and made the greatest part of it.

From verse 32 to 36, Christ tells them that by the signs he has given, they may know the first question, When shall these things be? and assures them that the then generation of Jews should not die before they were all accomplished.

But as to the time of the other question, his coming again, he could not tell it, for he did not know it. It being only known to God.

Here, as has been observed by others, the two questions are as accurately distinguished by Matthew, as by any logician, by the opposition between *ταυτα* and *επειτα*, or as it is in English, 'This generation shall not pass away till all *these* things be fulfilled, but of *that* day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels, but my Father only.

Thus I have endeavoured to shew that the disciples Peter, James, and John, ask our Lord but two questions. That they ask these at once, and the confusion arises a good deal from this circumstance, and the courtesy of our Lord in endeavouring to answer both questions at once.

I have

I have endeavoured likewise to point when he speaks to the one question, and when he speaks to the other. And I think I have shewed that the superior degree of obscurity in Matthew above the other evangelists arises, from his using the word *τοτε*, *then*, in the 9th verse, instead of the expression in Luke xxi. 12. *πρὸ δε τελων απαντων*, *but before all these things*; or that in Mark xiii. 9. *βλεπετε δε υμεις εαυτους*, *but take heed to yourselves*; and to his using the word *ευθως*, *immediately*, in verse 29, instead of the expression in Mark xiii. 24. *αλλ εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις, μελα την θλιψιν*, *but in those days, after that tribulation*.

I need not observe, that this interpretation effectually takes off Mr. Gibbon's argument of our Lord's giving a false prophecy.

I am, Gentlemen,

Yours,

ANGLO-SCOTUS.

*An Attempt to illustrate the first ten verses
of the third Chapter of John's Gospel.*

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

I Send you an attempt to explain the conference of Nicodemus with our Lord. The leading idea of it, though not new, yet is not much known, at least not sufficiently, considering the light it throws upon this passage. I must however, entreat you, Gentlemen, to use your judgments in the case, and if it do not appear to you of sufficient importance, to suppress it.

The first person that I know of to have given the hint of this explanation is Maldonate; Mr. Evanson has likewise insisted on it in his letter to Bishop Hurd, p. 95, who seems to have taken it from Pble's Synopsis on Isai. xlvi. 1.

Although John has recorded none of the miracles (except the turning water into wine) or discourses of our Lord preceding this dialogue, yet it is very evident that both had previously taken place. That he had wrought miracles appears from John ii. 23. and the second verse of this chapter, "no man can do these miracles which thou doest." And that he had previously
preached

preached is evident from the miracles themselves, for he never did the one without the other. Now whenever Jesus preached, he proclaimed the glad tidings of the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God; or kingdom of Christ, for the different expression mean all one and the same thing: In Matt. iv. 23. Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom; that kingdom which Daniel prophesied the God of heaven was to begin to set up during the reign of the fourth monarchy, and which was to stand for ever; but which, though begun then, was not to be completed till a long period after, till the nobleman, Christ, who went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, was put in possession of it at his return. And when he returns, he frequently assures us, that he shall sit upon the throne of his kingdom. As Christ therefore, in all his discourses constantly mentioned this kingdom, it is very natural to suppose, that Nicodemus came to sound him about that which made the unceasing subject of his discourses. The words of Nicodemus have the air of a person sitting and enquiring after something which he has doubts upon: Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him. It is well known that the Jews universally expected that the Messiah when he came, would set up a temporal monarchy. Jesus perceiving what Nicodemus was driving at, cuts him off short, by telling him, that no man can enter into this king-

O 2

dom

dom except he be born again. I shall not stop at present upon this expression, but only observe, that Nicodemus did not understand our Lord of any mystical spiritual moral birth, but a renovation of life, a second production into being, as is evident from his answer. How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born?

In verse 5. Jesus again asserts the necessity of the same birth, as an admission to this kingdom, adding also, the necessity of another birth as well as this, the being born of water. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

The emphasis and solemnity with which our Lord pronounces this, prefaced by the words verily, verily, must make his assertion to be some indubitable verity, beyond all cavil and contradiction. He cannot, therefore, be speaking of baptism. For it is not true of this rite that except a man submit to it, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Hundreds and thousands of Jews who never were baptized, are both of the kingdom of God in this world, and will be so in the next, and will sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who were no more baptized than themselves.

Numbers who only know the Deity from his works, and the light of reason, will sit down with these in the kingdom of God, when the children of the kingdom will be excluded. For of a truth God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness

righteousness is accepted with him. Our Lord therefore, could not, according to the common interpretation, pronounce that to be such indubitable verity which was quite otherwise.

It cannot be true even on their own principles. Christian baptism, I mean baptism by Christ, was not yet, as far as appears, instituted. Suppose therefore, Nicodemus to have had all the good dispositions necessary for a member of this kingdom, but immediately after this conference to have died of an apoplectic fit. He could not, according to this, enter into the kingdom, because he had not partaken of a rite which was not yet instituted. Yet they hold the salvation of all who come to Christ.

I shall now attempt a very different interpretation of the phrase *being born of water*.

Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Origines Sacrae*, b. iii, p. 421. has shewn, that it was the very earliest opinion, that water was the first principle of all things. He quotes Aristotle, as affirming this, though the doctrine was in direct opposition to his own. His words are *τὴς πανταρχῆς ἢ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς νύκτος γενέσεως ἢ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γενέσεως*, that the most ancient and remote persons, and first writers in theology, held this opinion of water being the first material principle of things, p. 429.

He quotes Cicero *De nat. Deo*. l. 1, c. 29, to prove it to have been the opinion of Thales; his words are, *aquam dixit esse initium rerum, deum autem eam mentem quæ ex aquâ cuncta finxerit*.

He proves likewise, that this was the opinion of the ancient Egyptians. As Thales was derived

from the Phœnicians, both he and the Egyptians might have gotten it from the same source, i. e. the writings of Moses. For this opinion of Thales seems to be little else but a translation of Gen. i. 3. and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; where we see water is represented to have been in being from the first, and that it was by the energy of God upon this, that trees, animals, &c. were produced. That water was the first principle of all things, appears without controversy, to have been the opinion of the apostle Peter, 2 Pet. iii. 5, where he says, *ἡ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστώσα*, that the earth was formed out of water, and consisted by means of water; in other words, that it was the first principle of all things. And this may be all that the early Ebionites did, when they were so absurdly charged by Epiphanius, with revering water as a God. Hist. of Opinions, vol. iii. p. 206. See Just. Mart. ad Græcos cohort. p. 4. D. Paris Edit. and Wetstein on 2 Pet. iii. 5. who brings many proofs of this being the opinion both of Jews and heathens.

As they held water to be the first principle of all things, of course they deemed it to be that of generation. *Generationis matura et, veluti mater aqua est, qua maxime omnium rerum humida est, et humidum ut Philosophi docent generationis materia est.* Quam rationem et Turullian in lib. de baptismo et Chrysostom Hom. in John. ii. 5. Ambrose, lib. 2. de sacrament. cap. 6. et Hieron. Epes, ad Oceanum indicarunt, Maldonate. in loco. As I have not the books he refers to, I must take his word that all these fathers, and
before

before them the philosophers held water to be the matter, and as it were the mother of generation.

Justin Martyr says, some philosophers held the soul to be *ὕδωρ γενεοποιον*, aqua genitilis. Ad Græc. p. 8. Par. Edit. and in his dialogue with Trypho he says, that at our *first birth* *γεννημεθα ἐξ υγρας σπορας*, and the resurrection he calls the mystery of our *second birth*, or being born again, *τὸ μυστηριον παλιν τῆς γενεσεως ημων*.

This notion that water is the matter of generation seems likewise to be borrowed from the scriptures. In Deut. xxiii. 28. the Israelites are called the fountain of Israel, because they sprung from it. Israel then shall dwell in safety alone, the fountain of Israel shall be upon a land of corn and wine. Thus in Ps. lxviii. 28. Bless ye the Lord God in the congregation, ye that flow from the fountain of Israel.

That which produces man is called water also in Prov. v. 15. Drink *waters* out of thine own cistern, and running waters out of thine own well. Shall thy fountains be dispersed abroad, and rivers of waters in the streets? See Le Clerc in loco. Let them be only to thyself, and strangers have nothing in common with thee. Let thy *fountain* be blessed, and rejoice with the wife of thy youth. But above all in the passage of Isaiah xlviii. 1. Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which are called by the name of Israel, and are come forth out of the *waters of Judah*.

Since then Moses, Solomon, Isaiah, Peter, and the Jews in the age following him, thought water to have been the first principle of all things, since

they thought it to be the matter of generation, since we are said in holy writ to have come forth of water, why should it be thought strange that Christ adopted either the popular sentiments of his own countrymen, or the phraseology of scripture, and called our first birth the being born of water?

Christ, therefore, does not talk in the cruel ænigmas generally supposed to Nicodemus; he does not tell him of the indispensable necessity towards salvation of submitting to a christian ordinance, which, as appears from John iii. 22. was not yet instituted; but only tells him what he told Pilate, that the kingdom which he preached, and which Nicodemus was now sounding him about, was not of this world, but the next. That a man must be born twice to enter into it, once in the natural way of water, and the second time of the spirit at the resurrection.

V. 6. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. This is only saying with St. Paul, that there is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body, that the animal body is sown at the first in corruption, *ἐν υἱῶν σαρκός*, or in water, and it is raised in incorruption. That it is sown an animal body, and is raised a spiritual body, and that flesh and blood cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.

V. 8. Every body knows that *πνεῦμα*, here rendered *wind*, perpetually means in scripture the breath of life, see Ps. civ. 29, 30. cxlvi. 4. 1 Sam. xxx. 12. Matt. xxvii. 50. John xix. 30. and Law's Appendix, Carlisle edit. p. 385. Ps. lxxvii. 39. *Ἐμνήθη ὁ θεὸς ὅτι πνεῦμα πορεύομενοι.* He remembered that

that they were but flesh, a *wind* that passeth away. I should paraphrase this verse thus :

The breath of life bloweth as it chuseth; i. e. it comes without your choice or consent, thou hearest the sound thereof, but thou canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. It was given us without our knowledge, and is taken away without consulting us. So is every one that is born of the spirit ~~again~~, *again*, as one MS. reads it, i. e. You are equally ignorant of the natural means the Great Being will make use of towards your living again, as your living at first. The one is as unknown to you as the other.

V. 9. By this question I should suppose Nicodemus to have been a Sadducee. We know that many others of the Sanhedrim were such, Acts v. 17. It is the same as the Sadducean objection, 1 Cor. xv. 35. *τις ἐγερσεται ἢ νεκροί*; *how* are the dead raised up.

V. 10. Art thou a teacher of Israel and knowest not these things? This might be a retort for his *how*. The generality of the scribes held a future state and resurrection, and Nicodemus had the same means of information that they had. They might possibly be able to gather the doctrine (for gather it they did) from Isa. xxviii. and Ezek. xxxvi. where it is remarkable that the whole which the prophet calls to animate the dead, is this *רוּחַ חַיִּים*, the breath of life, which in both places our translators have rendered *wind*.

Here the dialogue of our Lord and Nicodemus ends, according to the valuable hint given by Christophilos, vol. v. p. 70, of your Repository. It is a hint which throws more light upon the remainder

mainder of the chapter than whole folios have done. I lament that that masterly pen can no longer move in defence of its own hypothesis. It claims my gratitude and respect for the information already given. I would only observe, that one of the ancient versions reads, v. 11. I say unto *you*, not *thee*, as if the text had been *man*.

Any interpretation almost of scripture, different from that commonly received, will appear at the first forced and unnatural. Yet, notwithstanding this, I do not fear but that this will appear, after a little reflection, to put much less force upon our Saviour's and Nicodemus's words, than the common one. It makes Christ discourse of the great end of his mission, the bringing life and immortality to light through the gospel, like an honest teacher, with the design of being understood, and not like an impostor, without any commission, wrapping himself up in mystery and riddles, where there does not appear to have been the least occasion for them.

I am your's,

•A N G L O - S C O T U S,

Difficulties

Difficulties in the Interpretation of some Prophecies not yet fulfilled, and Queries relating to them.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING given, as you will perceive, a good deal of attention to the subject of *prophecy*, and having met with difficulties, which, considering the nature of the subject, you will not be surprised at, difficulties which I am not able to solve; I take the liberty to propose them to your learned correspondents, hoping that when many persons are looking the same way, what escapes the observation of one may strike that of others.

In the prophecy of Ezekiel, ch. xxxviii, xxxix. and likewise in the Revelation, xx. 8. we have an account of the expedition of Gog and Magog. According to the former, they invade the Israelites immediately upon their return to the land of Canaan, but meet with a dreadful overthrow; after which the Israelites continue in the undisturbed possession of their country to the end of time.

In the book of Revelation also Gog and Magog are described as invading *the camp of the saints and the holy city*, and as being *devoured with fire from God out of heaven*; which so much resembles the fate of Gog and Magog in Ezekiel, that we
are

are naturally led to suppose that the two prophecies must refer to the same event. But then the *times* seem to be different. For the expedition of Gog and Magog in the Revelation is subsequent to the millenium, or the thousand years of rest and peace which follows the first resurrection, and it immediately precedes the general resurrection and the future judgment.

Are these *two* events, resembling one another, or are they *the same*? To suppose them to be different events, resembling one another, and therefore described by the same terms, is so like the double sense of prophecies (which makes them to be no proper prophecies at all) that I cannot reconcile myself to this mode of interpretation. I therefore rather suppose that the events are the same, and that the prophecy in the Revelation has a reference to that in Ezekiel, though I am not able to make them coincide in point of *time*. They agree sufficiently well in all other circumstances.

Another difficulty I would propose relates to the time when our Lord's proper *kingdom* may be said to commence. From his own language on the subject, we are naturally led to infer, that it will commence at his *second coming*, which is always represented as coinciding with his coming to raise the dead, and judge the world. Thus he speaks of his *going to receive* (or to be appointed to) *a kingdom*, and the apostles and others are said to reign with him in his kingdom; and yet the apostle Paul seems to represent this kingdom as terminating with the day of judgment. For then he says *it will be delivered up to God, even the Father*, 1 Cor. xv. 24.

Shall we then suppose that what is called *the day of judgment* may, in fact, be a long period of time, commensurate to the proper kingdom of Christ, in which the dead of past ages may rise, not perhaps all together, but in succession, according to some law, or rule, at present unknown to us?

This will not, indeed, correspond to the literal interpretation of our Saviour's and the apostle Paul's account of his second coming, according to which all the dead will be assembled before him in the air, and he will pronounce a solemn sentence first on all the righteous, and then on all the wicked. But few persons will find much difficulty in supposing that this is only a figurative description of the transaction. For, if every man's character is then to be made manifest to all the world, or even only to those who were acquainted with him, by actual intercourse, or otherwise, so that the equity of divine providence may appear in his past, as well as his future destination, the business cannot be transacted in so short a time, or in that manner. And as this seems to be the proper *end* of a day of judgment, we may assure ourselves that it will be done, whatever *time* may be requisite for the purpose.

More difficulty will perhaps be thought to arise from the account that Paul gives of the dead in Christ rising first, and before any change take place in the living. But even this may have been only a scenical representation, exhibited to him in vision, like those in the revelation made to John, and therefore may not literally correspond to the fact.

On

206 *Difficulties in the Interpretation*

On this hypothesis, indeed, the reign of Christ will be *on the earth*: But still his kingdom, though it be *in the world*, it will not be *of the world* in the sense in which our Saviour meant to be understood, viz. of such a kingdom as those of the world now are. It is called the *kingdom of heaven*; but it may well deserve to be so called, if it be a kingdom set up, as we read, in Daniel, by *the God of heaven*, though it be not literally above the clouds, which is only a figurative representation, adapted to vulgar conceptions; according to which God must have some particular place of residence; and because this is not on the earth, it is supposed to be somewhere above the clouds: whereas God is at all times equally present in all places. Peter evidently thought that the righteous would inhabit the earth, in a renovated state, though, in the usual language of scripture, the reward of good men is said to be in heaven.

Many persons, willing to give some proper length to the reign of Christ, have supposed that the millenium of the Revelation will be the period of it, and that he will be the king of the Jews on their return from their present dispersion. But to this hypothesis there is, I think, an unanswerable objection, from the account that Ezekiel gives of the future princes of the house of David. For he represents them as having children, Ezek. xlvi. 16. *Thus saith the Lord, if the prince give a gift to any of his sons, the inheritance thereof shall be his sons. It shall be their possession by inheritance.* This circumstance must have been overlooked by Burnet of the Charter-house

house, when, in his treatise *De Mortuorum Resurrectione*, he supposed that both the future happy state of the Jews, and the reign of Christ as the Messiah, over them, will be subsequent to the first resurrection. I own, however, that I have been much inclined to his opinion, that the Elijah of Malachi is not yet come, but is to precede the coming of Christ in glory, whenever that shall be.

I am sensible that the prophecies of scripture were not intended to make us prophets, or to give us so exact a knowledge of future events, as we shall find literally verified when they come to pass; but only such general ideas of the future state of things, as will satisfy us that there could not have been so near a correspondence of the prediction to the event without a real foresight into futurity. And with respect to our conduct, it is quite sufficient if the account of our future condition be only so far true, as that we may be assured the virtuous will find a proper reward, and the wicked an adequate punishment in it, in whatever manner this be effected.

In the mean time, it is pleasing, and can do no harm, to speculate with the greatest freedom on all great and interesting subjects. Indeed it is not possible to avoid forming some idea or other of a state in which we are so much interested, if we live with a view to a future life at all; and general, or abstract ideas, have no existence. Whether our ideas be right or wrong, they will always be particular and definite. We may, therefore, be allowed to endeavour to make them as correct as we can; and it may be amusing,

ing, and not even unuseful, to consider such as different persons form at present. It may even be a subject of no improper entertainment to look back upon, and compare, our present imperfect views of things with the reality, as we shall find it to be hereafter.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your very humble servant,

PAMPHILUS.

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

If you think the following strictures on the observations of Pamphilus, on the inspiration of Christ, worthy of a place in your Repository, they are submitted to your discretion by

Gentlemen, your reader,

JODVADIB.

I Profess myself a friend to free enquiry, nor do I imagine that the cause of truth can suffer by any investigations of this kind, conducted on the data which we possess for discovering truth. The character of Jesus Christ is the subject of the following strictures, and of which

which we must judge either by *analogy*, or by express *revelation*.

Your correspondent Pamphilus seems inclined uniformly to delineate the character of our Saviour from analogy; and, occupying perhaps too hastily his ground, that Jesus Christ in his moral capacity, as well as in his natural endowments, is a mere man like ourselves, he infers that he not only was *peccable*, but had in a variety of instances *erred*.

I confess that I am not yet prepared to give up the idea of the miraculous conception, most evidently alluded to both by Matthew and Luke, though it may be just to infer that the writer of the article against the miraculous conception is the same that penned the observations on the character of Christ. On my scheme the argument from analogy falls to the ground, because Jesus Christ was an *unique*. Being the son of God in a sense different from any other being clothed with human powers, I find no difficulty in supposing that he possessed moral capacities of a superior kind to any other man. It certainly appears, in an early period of his life, that he possessed more knowledge than any of his cotemporary youths; since he was able to hold arguments with, and make enquiries of, the most eminent Jewish teachers.

All the observations of Pamphilus appear to me to be suppositions. He tells us Christ *might* be this, and *might not* be that. That it was not essential to his divine mission that he should be a philosopher, or an anatomist. But it was essential to his character that he should be a *righteous man*; and that he knew what he spoke,

nor was he deceived in his testimony. Your correspondent is free to declare that he could not rely on the testimony of Jesus Christ, had he said that Lazarus had a soul that was distinct from his breath, and insinuates that the son of God knew no better than that the madmen of Judea were possessed by devils, p. 438. Perhaps the case of the demoniacs is not yet sufficiently understood by us to pronounce absolutely upon it; and if so, the popular opinion, and the opinion of Mr. Farmer, may appear to many equally defective, the truth remaining yet to be discovered. The presumption of Pamphilus, that our Saviour was in all points like ourselves, *sin* and *error* not excepted (See p. 441. 447.) and that he was not a greater nor better man than Abraham, Joseph, and Daniel, is a mere *gratis dictum*. For, in fact, the scriptures speak a very different language respecting our Saviour's character, when it is compared with any other character.

The truth is, that the character of Christ is represented as *uniformly good*, whereas the character of others is only *partially* so. This difference appears to me to be of great importance in order that the attention of the world should be fixed on the son of God, the only Saviour of men, and the great author of the perfection of the dispensations of God. Other messengers of the Deity were introduced to the notice of men under more obscure dispensations, and consequently it cannot be improper to infer that their powers and characters were of a limited and less perfect nature, more especially when we consider that all nations are commanded to believe in

in, and follow, the son of God only. Surely there must be either a dignity of person, or a perfection of character, belonging to this illustrious messenger of the Deity, that ought to challenge the attention, and secure the hopes of men, very different from, and, permit me to add, very superior to, any thing that had before been exhibited to the world. It is in this view the subject concludes in Heb. i. where the apostle explains the superior advantages of christians for perfecting holiness in the service of God.

Perhaps I have as high an idea as Pamphilus can have of the importance of the revelation of immortality through the medium of a resurrection, yet I cannot subscribe to the article, that this was the *sole* object of our Saviour's mission. To me it appears, with evidence, that the object of his mission was the reconciliation of men to God, and that the discovery of a future life is made in order to influence the guilty to return to their allegiance. A future life is the most powerful motive to effectuate this purpose; but it does not follow that other considerations and discoveries make no part of our Lord's divine mission. He came to call men to repentance, and for this purpose he holds out to them rewards and punishments beyond the grave. Rather, then, I should describe the object of the mission of our Saviour to be the calling men to *repentance*, urged, chiefly, by the hopes of reward, or the fear of punishment, after the general resurrection.

But we never find Christ encouraging men to expect forgiveness of sin upon repentance from his own example, which however, according to

the idea of Pamphilus, must have been the most persuasive consideration, and every way proper, if he had erred: on the contrary, though possessing the most sublime humility, he invariably holds to view the perfection of his own character, and challenges his bitterest enemies to fully it. In short, though the scriptures teach us to believe that Jesus Christ is a man, yet they invariably lead us to infer that he was a man called into being by the immediate interposition of the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Deity: here we are taught to believe that he was honoured with greater degrees of the confidence of our heavenly Father than any other man, even prior to his submission to the death of the cross; and consequently there are reasons to conclude, since he was intended to execute a *particular* and the most important commission, he had original powers granted him that were adequate to this high trust.

Every thing that tends to confirm this idea we have in the history of the life of Christ: his life was spotless, he being holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners—to him the world is directed to look as to the only original perfect character that raises our admiration, and charms our heart! His apostles, though they had all the assistance of his doctrine and example, were but partially good; their foibles and sins being recorded, but we find no extenuation of these attempted from any thing that was annexed to the character of Jesus Christ. On the contrary, christians are directed still to look to their leader, to trust in him as being incapable of misleading them through *ignorance*, or *deceiving* them

them through *guile*. Could they have supposed that he was unacquainted with the ancient revelation of the deity, they would have paused, would have hesitated in following implicitly such a leader, who on this supposition might be right, or might be wrong.

To my view, the supposition of our Saviour's ignorance and error, that the hypothesis of Pamphilus admits, is extremely injurious to his moral character: for in that case I cannot comprehend how he could have said that he spake and testified what he had heard and seen. And it is worthy of observation, that even the Jews, with all their prejudices, were not able to charge him with having misrepresented their prophetic writings, or the law of Moses, except in cases that were instantly refuted. This is no proof that he spoke at random, that he misapplied scripture, and that he was under the inspiration of the deity but at certain seasons.

Perhaps no reasons could have been of greater importance than those which united the testimony of the prophets and the Messiah, or explained the connexion between the Jewish and christian religion. The supposition that it was necessary that Jesus Christ was liable to err, and was in many instances ignorant, in order that he might be a proper example for us, proves too much; for if it was necessary that he should sin in *one case*, it was necessary that he should be guilty of all the sins that his followers should commit that he might taste all sin for all men. All that was necessary was that the perfect will of God should be revealed, a perfect example of virtue exhibited, a resurrection to eternal life

P 3

asserted,

asserted, and illustrated in the rising of our redeemer from the grave.

The apostles place great stress on this last fact, but not with a view wholly to prove that men shall rise to eternal life, but to prove the truth of our Saviour's claims. It may be considered most certainly as a collateral proof of this interesting event, but it doth not absolutely satisfy the mind, because the circumstances in our Saviour's life and resurrection are not exactly parallel with those of his followers. The perfection of his virtue, the cause in which he suffered, and the ignominy that attended his death, are appendages to the character of the Son of God which do not apply to the greatest part of his disciples.

They might hope for a resurrection were they exactly like him from analogy. But since they differ, since they are less virtuous, and follow his steps at a humble distance, the hope of a resurrection to eternal life must be built on the power of God, the promise of Christ, confirmed by the testimony which his heavenly Father gave of his approbation of his conduct, by raising him from the grave.

Pamphilus, in speaking of the judgment to come, is quite lost in the field of conjecture, and no wonder when he is under the necessity of constituting an *erring, fallible* man to be the judge of the whole universe !

But when I look on the redeemer as a man in whom the fulness of the godhead dwelt, possessing moral powers that inclined him invariably to knowledge and virtue ; when I consider him not only without the least stain of evil, but also perfectly free from guile ; when I rest
satisfied

satisfied that he was possessed of the Holy Ghost above measure, by which he was acquainted with the secrets of the human heart, I must also infer that he knew the sense of the prophecies. When his friends and his enemies united in acquitting him of perverting the scriptures, and the whole tenor of his conduct bespoke the most perfect innocence, and entire confidence in the *justice* of his Father; and finally, when I can find nothing like a dissatisfaction manifested by our Lord at what he had done, or at what he had omitted, I conclude that he was a *perfect character*; a character ever to be looked up to with reverence, but can never be equalled by any of his followers. Such is, and such must be the character of the judge of the quick and the dead!

If Jesus Christ had sinned, then he merited death. *For the wages of sin is death*, and he must have stood in need of repentance, before he could have been accepted on those very terms which himself published.

The observations of Pamphilus on the little importance of forming correct ideas of the *person* of Christ, may have some justice in them, but I think bear hard on the design of the Theological Repository, as some of the principal communications to that work respect the person of our Saviour. All perhaps that was necessary to illustrate the benevolence of the Deity, was to employ a messenger to reveal his will, attended with the most suitable and credible evidences of the divinity of his mission. It is on this principle that I contend for the perfection of the character of Jesus Christ, because, in my view, it forms a material part of the evidence that he was the *saviour of the world*.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

ON reading the paper signed Pamphilus, in the last number of your Repository, after considering the contents with great pleasure and satisfaction; and feeling the force of his proofs in favour of a *temporal prince* who is to spring from the stem of Jesse, to be *the leader*, or *great prince* of the children of Israel, to restore them to their country, &c, it immediately occurred to my mind that the *name* whereby this prince should be called, was foretold first by Daniel, see ch. x. 13. 21. and ch. xii. 1, and afterwards by St. John, see Rev. ch. xii. 7. who prophecies of the same events, and in all probability, means the same person; *Michael* being the *name* given to the prince by *both* of them. I apprehend Jude ver. 9. cannot be any objection to my conjecture; because *Michael* mentioned there is said to be an *archangel*, and besides we do not find this history any where in scripture but in Jude's epistle. The moral and political changes which have happened in human affairs have all been effected by *men*, who are instruments in the hands of God to accomplish his purposes. And it is reasonable to suppose that they will continue to be so.

That so great a prince as Michael is represented to be should be called by *name* so long time before his birth, is not without a precedent in the prophetick writings. See Isaiah ch. xlv, And surely it cannot be of *less* concern to the Jews
now,

now, to know the name of their future deliverer, than heretofore. If there be any truth in the above suggestion, it will only affect the following passage in the observations, &c. of Pamphilus, viz. "But no particular prince is mentioned as "instrumental in their deliverance." See page 242.

Also the prophecy alluded to in the Revelations will be found easier of explication than is commonly received; as the language is highly figurative throughout.

How far the name of *Michael* agrees with that whereby he is called *our righteousness* by Jeremiah. See ch. xxiii. 6, and ch. xxxiii. 16, I pretend not to say.

PHILALETHES.

An Account of the Rev. John Palmer, and of some Articles intended by him for this Repository.

MANY of our readers will be looking for the conclusion of the important article concerning *the mission of John the Baptist*, signed CHRISTOPHILOS, which, on the cover of the last number of this work, they were informed was delayed on account of the illness of the writer. It is with much concern I now acquaint them, that this truly excellent critic is no more. He died very suddenly, almost as soon as the notice above-mentioned was printed off. As he distinguished himself

himself so much by his communications to this work, it will not, I think, be improper to give a short account of him in it, and of what I know of his intentions with respect to it, if it had pleased the author of life to spare him longer. Having had much of his confidence, I know that I am at full liberty to inform our readers, that the person whose death they justly lament was the Rev. John Palmer, late of Macclesfield in Cheshire, but last of Birmingham, and that his other signatures in the Repository were SYMMACHUS and ERASMUS.

Besides being so considerable a contributor to this work, he was particularly useful to me, in correcting for the press, and recomposing, any articles that seemed to require it. In this, and in many other respects, I consider myself in particular, as well as the christian world, and the lovers of free inquiry, in general, as having sustained a great loss by his death. Indeed, in benevolence, and a readiness to assist his friends, no man could exceed him. His ardour in the cause of religious liberty, and his zeal to promote the interests of pure christianity, were unbounded; and through his whole life, but more especially after the opening of the *Repository*, he gave a great proportion of his time to the study of the scriptures; and in the pursuit of truth he was equally sagacious and fearless.

As Mr. Palmer's death was sudden*, and, through an almost total incapacity of writing for

* His disorder was at first of the bilious kind; but in vomiting a large blood vessel was burst. After this he was much weakened, something of a paralysis (which he thought to be the rheumatism) seized his hands and arms; and at last he was carried off by a stroke of the palsy. I dined with him the day before his death (on Tuesday the 26th of December) when he thought himself better, and was very cheerful.

the

the last half year of his life, he has left few notes of what he had meditated, it is not in my power (though our conversation, whenever I was with him, chiefly turned on theological subjects, and what he was intending for the Repository) to favour our readers with many particulars; but the little that I am able to recollect of this kind I shall communicate. One of the last things that he expressed was a wish to see me; and if there had been time for it, he would, I doubt not, have mentioned something relating to his articles for the Repository, and I should then have been able to give our readers much more satisfaction than I can now promise them.

One article more would have concluded what Mr. Palmer intended to communicate on the subject of *the mission of John the Baptist*; and it would have consisted chiefly of *corollaries*, the principal of which was the impossibility of the truth of the chief particulars in the history of the miraculous conception, and of the birth of John; as they suppose such a knowledge of Jesus being the Messiah, as it is evident that neither the parents of John, nor the mother of Jesus, could have had; John himself, and our Lord's own disciples after the death of John, being ignorant, or at least very doubtful, with respect to it.

Mr. Palmer also intended to have shewn how his hypothesis, of the ignorance of John the Baptist concerning the messiahship of Jesus, throws light on many circumstances in the gospel history. But there remained one difficulty, which he was not able to remove; and this related to our Lord's conversation with the woman of Samaria. On this occasion he acknowledged that he was the Messiah, and

and it was also known to all the inhabitants of the town of Sychar.

This, Mr. Palmer thought, was hardly consistent with the ignorance of the apostles in general of that important truth, some time afterwards, as the events are arranged in all Harmonies. Our Lord's enquiry of his disciples, concerning what the people of the country in general, and even what themselves in particular, thought of him, implies that they had been left to their own reflections on the subject; and that neither John the Baptist, nor himself, had ever told them plainly that he was the Messiah.

Our Saviour's instructions also to the twelve, not to go into any city of the Samaritans, Matt. x, Mr. Palmer thought was hardly consistent with himself having preached, and having acknowledged his true character, more explicitly to Samaritans than he had ever done to any Jews. This difficulty he would have stated, and have requested the assistance of our learned correspondents for the solution of it. This assistance I earnestly wish for myself.

Under the signature of SYMMACHUS, Mr. Palmer intended some farther illustration of the epistle to the Hebrews, thinking that many passages in it decisively proved that the writer of it had no other idea of Jesus, than that of his being a mere man; and that no such hypothesis as that of his pre-existence (except on the scheme of the Gnostics) had even been thought of in that early period.

Mr. Palmer had also planned an article in defence of the older Socinians, who maintained that Jesus, at the time that he received his commission, was actually taken up to heaven, or at least conceived himself

himself to have been so taken up; and that it was to *this* that he alluded, when he spake of having *come down from heaven*. If Paul, Mr. Palmer thought, could imagine that he had been caught up to the third heaven, and could not tell whether what he experienced was a vision or a reality, well may we suppose that this had been the case with Christ, when he received his commission, and was instructed in all the particulars of it; which Mr. Palmer supposed took up the whole of the forty days, which, like Moses in the mount, he passed fasting. For the temptation did not commence till these forty days were expired.

The divine Being, though equally present in all places, yet being generally imagined to have a more particular place of residence *in heaven*, or above the clouds, it may well be supposed that our Saviour, during his intercourse with God (in which he would probably be insensible of any connexion with the world) would conclude that he was in heaven. Consequently, when the vision was over, and he found himself on the earth, he would suppose that he had been brought down by the same power that had taken him up.

This hypothesis, Mr. Palmer thought, furnishes a better solution of our Saviour's saying that he had *come down from heaven*, and that he must *ascend* to the place *where he had been before*, than to suppose that he was really sensible that he had never been in the place that is called *heaven*, but, by every phrase of this nature, only meant his having had communications with God while he was on the earth. I acknowledge myself to be much pleased with Mr. Palmer's ideas on this subject.

Lastly,

Lastly, Mr. Palmer had planned an article in answer to a criticism of NEPIODIDASCALOS on the word *ἐξῆν*, *he is beside himself*, Mark iii. 21. in which he would have defended our common translation, and the application of the phrase to Christ, on the idea that, though, when interpreted literally, it signifies that a person is *mad*; yet, in a secondary sense, it might express only the very friendly regard of Jesus's mother and his brethren for him; when they thought that he was fatiguing himself too much, and in danger of hurting himself, as they might naturally suppose of him, in the circumstances in which he then was. He had been teaching all the preceding day, had spent the whole night on a mountain, probably without food, had afterwards chosen and instructed the twelve apostles, and was then surrounded by a great multitude, with whom he was engaged in earnest conversation. Among these were some Pharisees, with whom, on their saying that he cast out dæmons by the help of Beelzebub, he was expostulating with particular vehemence.

In these circumstances, Mr. Palmer thought that the friends of Jesus might, without meaning any reflection upon him, and only expressing the tenderest concern, say that he was *beside himself*, and did not consider the consequence of exerting himself as he did. Mr. Palmer also thought that this story is a proof that Jesus was much respected by his brethren, though at first they did not declare themselves his disciples.

Sorry I am that this is all I am able to recollect of what my very able assistant in this work intended for it. Considering how much he did execute, while he was able, let others be excited to follow his example,

example, and supply his place. Also, let us, who remain in the same field, double our diligence; that his loss may be the less sensibly felt; and let us pray that *the Lord of the harvest would send more such able and faithful labourers into his harvest.*

As many of our readers will be desirous of knowing some particulars of the life of Mr. Palmer, I shall take this opportunity of informing them, that he was a native of Norwich, born in the year 1742; that at the age of fourteen he was put under the care of Dr. Harwood at Congleton in Cheshire, and at seventeen began his academical studies at Warrington, where he continued five years. In the latter part of this period I was one of his tutors, and can testify that he was distinguished by his good behaviour, diligence and ingenuity.

His only settlement as a minister was at Macclesfield in Cheshire, where he continued fifteen years. There he married a daughter of Mr. Heald of that place, and she lived with him ten years. In 1777 he married, for his second wife, the eldest daughter of the Rev. Mr. White of Derby, by whom he had a daughter, now in the third year of her age. He removed to Birmingham in 1779; where he had no regular employment as a minister, but was always ready to assist any of his friends.

Beside the services Mr. Palmer rendered to the christian world in the *Repository*, under the signatures of *Cbristophilos*, *Symmachus*, and *Erasmus* in the last volumes, and of G. H. in the three first, he wrote a letter addressed to myself, and which is printed in the introduction to my *Harmony of the Gospels*,

Gospels; and was the author of the four following publications. 1. Free Remarks on a Sermon intitled, *The Requisition of Subscription to the thirty-nine Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England not inconsistent with christian liberty, &c.* in a letter to the author, By a Friend to Religious Liberty. Printed for J. Johnson, 1772. This, of all his publications, did not bear his name.

2. A Letter to Dr. Balguy, on the subject of his Charge, &c. with a Postscript relative to certain Observations contained in the Charge respecting the Dissenters, and Toleration, 1773.

3. A new scheme of Short Hand; being an Improvement upon *Mr. Byrom's Universal English Short Hand*, 1774.

4. An Examination of *Thelephthora*, on the subject of Marriage, 1781.

All these works shew marks of great ingenuity; and on the subject of religious liberty, he expressed himself with great spirit and animation.

Both Mr. Palmer, and my intimate friend Mr. Alexander (who was likewise of Birmingham) were cut off in the midst, or rather at the beginning, of their greatest usefulness. This appears to me to be one of the greatest difficulties in the plan of providence; though I have no doubt but that we shall some time hence see it, as well as every thing else, to have been right. One obvious and useful inference from it is, that we should lose no part of that *time*, which we see to be so very uncertain.

J. PRIESTLEY.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN;

THE following observations were drawn up before Dr. Priestley's Letters to Dr. Price appeared in public, and, I believe, before I entertained any expectation that he was about to write any. They were put aside, and you would scarcely have been troubled with them, but that a Friend who had seen them, conceived that they were not altogether superseded by Dr. Priestley's letters; and, indeed, he has upon the whole considered a different part of Dr. Price's argument, from what is noticed below. It is submitted to you, Gentlemen, whether they have any any title to your patronage.

Your respectful servant,

DAVIDES.

*Remarks upon some observations in Dr.
Price's Sermons, relating to the Person
and Character of Jesus Christ.*

ONE cannot but admire the amiable spirit,
which dictated the valuable sermons, lately
published by the truly great and excellent Dr.
VOL. VI. Q Price.

Price. In consequence of the very extensive reputation and influence of the Author, one may indulge the pleasing expectation that they will be the happy means of transfusing the principles of liberality not into our own hearts merely, but into the hearts of men who inhabit a distant country. The views which he has of Christianity, will probably less impede their usefulness in this respect, than would the views of those who differ more widely than he does from the popular faith. It is with the utmost respect, that we propose to offer a few observations upon some of the reasons he alleges in support of his sentiments concerning the person of our Saviour Christ.

After remarking that the mere appellation *Son of God*, implies nothing more than the *pre-eminence* of Jesus as a Prophet and Messenger from God, and having, with an exemplary love of truth, endeavoured to show that it affords no argument in favour of his *pre-existence*; the Doctor proceeds to state those reasons which influence his judgment in this instance, and which to him seem to prove this doctrine. The first of his observations to this effect, relates to the connexions and dependencies, which take place in the creation. He remarks that the earth is nothing to the solar system, the solar system, to the system of fixed stars, and the system of fixed stars, to that system of systems, of which it is a part: and that it is probable, that far beyond all, which we can possibly descry, numberless scenes of existence are exhibited, of which we can no more

more form a notion than a man born blind can form a notion of light and colours. After offering some fine observations upon the same subject, he draws this conclusion, that "since" *corporeal* nature is thus extensive and grand; "incorporeal nature (that is the intellectual universe) must be much more so," and adds, that spiritual beings have undoubtedly connexions and dependencies, like those which are exhibited in the material universe.

The Doctor is pretty full in his general observations, but has been scarcely so precise and explicit as one could wish, in the application of them to the point under consideration. His readers seem to be expected of themselves to discover the dependence of the two propositions upon each other, that man is connected with other intelligent beings, and that Jesus Christ was an intelligent being superior to man, through whom this connexion subsists. One cannot but think (and it is a thought, which affords one the sublimest pleasure) one cannot but think that this world and all the creatures which inhabit it, make but a small part, an infinitely small part of an immense and glorious system, guided by the omnipotent hand of him, who is All in All. The whole universe is probably linked together indissolubly; but in a manner which can be perceived only by omniscience itself. Our ideas upon this subject must necessarily be very general and imperfect, and, as it appears to me, much too general and imperfect to serve as any part of a foundation for the superstructure of such a notion as that of Christ's pre-existence.

Q 2

Some

Some persons will be at a loss to perceive how it more naturally follows from a view of the connexions and dependencies of which we are speaking, that an *individual*, who lived on earth, and had the external appearance of a man, was previously an inhabitant of some other part of the universe, than that the *whole human species* pre-existed in some distant planet. Other persons may think it a more probable conclusion from the same premises, that Jesus Christ having begun his existence in this world, was supernaturally illuminated and trained up by almighty God, in order to become the medium of the divine dispensations in another world. His course must have begun somewhere (they may say) and why not on the earth? But to suppositions and hypotheses there is no end. It should seem, that we know but just enough to authorize us in concluding, that we are far from standing single in the creation, and that we may hope to be indulged hereafter with such views of the universe, as at present are compatible with neither our faculties nor our situation.

At the same time that we do not in our speculations overlook the *connexion* of the earth with other worlds; it is, perhaps, equally necessary for us to remember that *independence*, which most probably subsists. The ground we tread upon, may be unfriendly to the growth of any thing valuable, and the mind of man may be alike unfriendly, they may both bring forth weeds, without its affecting the rest of the universe.

“We see,” it is said, “the whole of existence *below*, filled with a variety, almost
“infinite.”

" infinite of different classes of beings, all re-
 " lated and connected. Who can doubt whether
 " all above us is alike full? whether there be
 " beings who have existed so long as to have
 " acquired an immense dignity, and to have
 " rendered their agency of the greatest impor-
 " tance in the creation?" But may it not with
 propriety be again asked, How do these general
 observations affect the particular point under
 consideration? The connexion subsisting be-
 tween *us* and *inferior* beings, is a connexion of
 the different species at large, and possibly it
 may be concluded from hence that some such
 connexion of the species subsists between us
 and *superior* intelligences. But the manner in
 which the connexion between us and inferior
 beings is preserved cannot bear the least re-
 semblance to that in which our connexion with
 superior orders of beings must be maintained, if
 Christ be the medium of that connexion. It
 is not preserved by any human creature veiling
 himself in the body of a brute, and associating
 with the brutal race. But it should seem that
 something of this kind must be seen before we
 can discover any analogy sufficiently clear for
 the foundation of an argument that Jesus was a
 man in appearance only. Why then should it
 be said that a denial of his pre-existence, " is in
 " a great measure derived from our narrow
 " ideas of the extent of creation, and of the
 " connexions and dependencies, which take
 " place in it?" Why may it not with equal
 propriety be said, that a denial of the pre-
 existence

existence of Moses, of Paul, or of the twelve Apostles, is derived from the same source?

Let us then proceed to those evidences, which this excellent and respectable person, considers as more to the purpose. "The history of our Saviour (he thinks) answers best to the opinion of the superiority of his nature:" and first, his introduction into the world by a miraculous conception, is an event which he looks upon as favouring this idea. But in the narratives of the event, there is no distant intimation that this miracle was wrought with the view of providing a body worthy to receive a celestial inhabitant. Besides, it may perhaps be worth remarking, that this circumstance of our Lord's being the immediate production of almighty power, if true, is, in one view unfavourable to the hypothesis espoused by Dr. Price. Those Christians who have adopted his sentiments, as well as the Athanasians, I conceive do not hesitate in allowing, that Christ "was truly a man and properly so called." (Serm. p. 140). But if his soul were *angelic*, and his body *more than human*; one should imagine that there can be no propriety in giving him this appellation, upon any ground.

The second particular in the history of our Lord, supposed to favour the opinion of the superiority of his nature, are the annunciations from heaven, proclaiming him to be the Son of God. It was observed in the beginning of these observations, that the Doctor has given it as his opinion, that when Jesus is styled the Son of God,

God, it points out his *pre-eminence* only as a prophet and messenger from God, in the support of which idea we are favoured with some very valuable, and, as it seems to me, satisfactory reasons. Why then should this phrase be considered as bearing any different meaning in the particular passages to which he alludes? There does not appear to be any ground for supposing that these annunciations were designed to give us any information concerning the natural dignity of his person, but to proclaim his character, and to command attention to his doctrine:—"Hear ye him,"

The third particular mentioned by the Doctor, is "our Lord's giving himself out as come from God to offer his life for the life of the world, and to shed his blood for the remission of sins." Is it not surprising on the other hand, that a Being of such eminence, a Being by whom the world itself was created and governed, should undergo not merely the common evils of humanity, should be treated not merely with indignity, with insult and derision, but should languish under tortures prepared for the vilest of men, and the most criminal of malefactors? Had such a measure made a necessary part of the divine œconomy, would it not have been natural for Christ to have given some hint of the amazing dignity of his nature, in *connexion* with his predictions of his future sufferings? Would his Apostles, when expressing their indignation at the treatment which their master met with, have been able to refrain from accusing the Jews of having crucified the Creator of the World?

Q 4

But

But so far was this from being their conduct, that we find our Lord, when apprizing his disciples of what he was about to endure, speaking of himself under the title of "the Son of Man*," which one should think must be very far from giving his hearers the idea, that the death of some great angelic Being would be necessary for human salvation. Peter, in like manner, accuses the Jews, of having "slain by wicked hands†," not a pre-existent spirit, the Creator of the World, but "Jesus of Nazareth, a MAN approved of God:" and when he again addresses them upon the same subject, and seems desirous of impressing them with a lively idea of the nature of their offence, and of the dignity and excellence of Jesus, he speaks of him, as "the holy one and the just" (in contradistinction to Barabbas) and "the Prince of life‡," terms which, though purposely expressive of his eminence, would scarcely convey to their minds any notion of his being more than human. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews, likewise, so far from intimating that the death of a celestial Being was requisite, seems to think that in making "reconciliation for the sins of the people," there was a peculiar propriety in his being "made like unto his brethren§," a likeness which would have subsisted in *appearance* only, if he were of a nature infinitely superior to his brethren. When the apostle John, also, speaks of Christians laying down *their* lives for

* Matt. xx. 18 and 28.

† Acts ii. 22; 23.

‡ Acts iii. 14, 15.

§ Heb. ii. 17. and 9.

the

the brethren, in imitation of their master's conduct*; does it not show that he conceived, the life of a *human* creature when offered up in the service of religion, must be a sacrifice acceptable to God?

The fourth circumstance alleged as a presumption, and, indeed, as more than a presumption, that Christ was a superior Being, literally descended from heaven, is "his perfect innocence, and sinless example." But should we not bear it upon our mind, that whatever were the excellence of his character, it is not ascribed to any *necessity of nature*. For in that case, he cannot truly and properly be said to have been "tempted in all points like as we are;" for how can this be affirmed of one, whose very nature and constitution rendered it *impossible* for him to be in the least degree affected by the temptations to which we are liable? How could the prospect of being made King of Judea, have the smallest influence upon his mind who created the world? How could the fear of death, have any effect upon him, who was not subject to death?" For it taketh not hold of angels, but it taketh hold of the seed of Abraham."

It farther seems to merit our attention, when considering this subject, that, excepting the introductions to Matthew's and Luke's gospel, the whole of what is written in the Christian scriptures concerning Jesus Christ, relates to him as a person who had sustained a public character,

* 1 John iii. 16,

We know not that there is any reference to that part of his life, which he spent in private, with which the generality of his apostles and followers were not, perhaps, very minutely acquainted. Before they became his disciples, they would scarcely think of making any enquiries about him: when attending upon him, they would probably have but little leisure for that purpose: and after his ascension, their whole thoughts were engaged by the grand object of preaching the gospel. Hence it seems likely, that their knowledge of his situation, and of the incidents of his life, before his baptism, was quite of a general nature. But were it ever so much the contrary, they do not appear to have left any traces of it in their writings; on account of which they are by no means deserving of censure, since it was undoubtedly their business to preach Jesus *the Christ*. One should imagine, therefore, that the utmost, which with any propriety can be considered as asserted by them in their strongest expressions, is, "that the whole conduct of their master, whilst he appeared under the character of a public teacher, was strictly unexceptionable and highly exemplary." If these ideas be well founded, there is, then, no necessity for supposing that he was either a pre-existent spirit, or "an angelic Being, created on purpose at the time of his conception." I am unable to see the least absurdity in admitting, that he might have acquired his virtuous dispositions, and habits in the same natural and gradual manner, that all other men do. By the time that he was thirty years

years of age, they might have acquired considerable firmness and stability, and the prospects which then opened upon him with such splendour, would powerfully tend to render him invulnerable.

For my own part, I must acknowledge, that my conceptions of the great goodness of Jesus, my reverence for his most excellent character, are founded not so much upon one or two incidental expressions to be met with in the epistles, as upon the historical accounts of him, transmitted to us from the four evangelists. Exalted as must be the idea which we should form of him, by a perusal of these artless narratives; I question if they would lead one to ascribe to him absolute impeccability. Indeed had our Lord's biographers, represented him as totally free from all the little weaknesses and imperfections of humanity; to me it seems a matter of great doubt at least, whether it would not have operated somewhat unfavourably to the credibility of their history. Is it not considered as an evidence of their having copied their representations from real life, that no shade is cast over the deformities of those, who make the leading figures in their picture? To be sure it was not to be expected, that they should studiously endeavour to display every frailty of those concerning whom they wrote: but had they roundly and peremptorily asserted, that they were drawing the portrait of a man, whose conduct never approached towards imperfection, in one single instance through his whole life; whose breast was never for a moment susceptible of a
single

single feeling unfriendly to the strictest purity, to the highest benevolence, to the sublimest devotion; who was never conscious of a transient thought, but what virtue herself inspired: would it not have appeared at the same time, that they were depicting an *unnatural* character, and, consequently, should we not have considered their history, so far at least, as a “cunningly devised fable?” If this be what is meant by *impeccability*; does it not seem to be for the interest and honour of christianity, to ascribe no such attribute to its author?

If this be what is meant by *impeccability*; it may, perhaps, be questioned, whether all christians have hitherto believed it, and whether the “modern Socinian,” to whom Dr. Price refers, hath advanced any novel sentiment. Though with respect to this latter point one would speak with much diffidence, being sensible that too great stress must not be laid upon single passages, since the most considerable men speak very differently, according to the particular views they happen to be taking of a subject. A passage or two, however, shall be transcribed, which seem to border very closely, at least, upon the opinion advanced by the modern Socinian. Mr. Cardale quotes* the following observation from Dr. R. Lucas’s sermons†. “The scriptures every where consider
“our Lord as a man, and as a man partaking of
“our infirmities, and tempted in all things like
“unto us; and in his sufferings supported not

* Inquiry into the True Doctr. of the N. T. p. 112.

† Vol. ii. on Heb. xii. 2. edit. 3d.

“ by

“ by his godhead, but by his faith; not by the
 “ second person in the Trinity within him, but
 “ by the joy that was set before him; and with-
 “ out this it will be hard to give an account of those
 “ natural passions (or *weaknesses* shall I say) which
 “ he discovered before, and in his crucifixion.”

This sentiment, Mr. Cardale considers, as being just and natural, and thinks, as “ nature
 “ is averse to pain, it is not wonderful, that our
 “ Saviour himself did with *sorrow and reluctance*
 “ prepare for the cross, and that when he hung up-
 “ on it, in his expiring moments, he should express
 “ himself as a man, though as a truly pious, good
 “ man, with a filial trust and confidence in God,
 “ as his God and Father. As a man (he adds) he
 “ doubtless had his fears as well as other passions,
 “ though his reason and piety controuled them.
 “ He sometimes uttered such *complaints* and
 “ groans, as are the language of nature under sore
 “ and heavy afflictions, or under some deep and
 “ inward pressure of mind; but he presently, al-
 “ most instantly, checked them, and always
 “ showed that he had a due command over them.”

How far the writers of these passages would approve of our putting such a sense upon them, as they seem to speak, it may be difficult to judge: but this much, I should think, may be looked upon as pretty clear, that the ideas which were in their minds, when they dictated the above (how long they remained there may perhaps be questioned) could not be widely different from those which are conveyed by the writer in the Theological Repository.

What

What Archdeacon Philpot says concerning the English Unitarians in the reign of Queen Mary, would carry more weight with it, did it not come from the mouth of a bitter enemy: though it is difficult to conceive how he should *invent* any thing of the kind to render them more odious. He says in his apology* for spitting on an Arian, "Cannot you bear
 " with me, who for the just zeal of the
 " glory of my God and Christ, did spit upon
 " the obstinately blinded Arian, making him
 " (Christ) but a creature as he was himself,
 " pretending *you to be without sin as well as*
 " *Christ.*"

The excellent author of the sermons before us, speaks of the modern Socinian he refers to as representing the scripture assertion that Christ "knew no sin," to mean much the same as what is said of a true Christian in 1 John iii. 9. "Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin: for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." As the Doctor seems not to have felt the force of this remark, one could wish that he had stated his objections to it. Probably he conceived that such an interpretation would be no sooner read than rejected. This, perhaps, would be the case with a majority of the Christian world, who would treat in the same manner what one may suppose must be the Doctor's own inter-

* See Strype's *Memorials Ecclesiastical*, vol. iii. p. 261. and Catalogue of Originals, p. 146. fol. 1721, or Lindsey's *Historical View*.

pretation,

pretation, of our Lord's assertion that "he and his Father are one." He well knows that the minds of the bulk of mankind, are infinitely more subject to the influence of established associations and habits of thinking, than to the influence of reason and argument.

If we attentively consider those passages, which by some are thought to be decisive, we may possibly see reason to doubt whether they will properly admit of the most extensive and unqualified application. In 2 Cor. v. 21. it is said, "for he (i. e. God) hath made him sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." It is clear from our Lord's history, that God did make him sin for us, that he caused him to be treated as a sinful person, as a malefactor, as one who had threatened to destroy the holy temple, and had spoken blasphemy against God. But he "knew no sin:" he was perfectly innocent of these charges. He "did no sin," (1 Pet. ii. 22.) he was not "buffeted for his faults," no "guile was found in his mouth," he "endured grief, suffering wrongfully:" even "when he was reviled, he reviled not again, when he suffered he threatened not, but committed himself to him, who judgeth righteously." This seems to me to be the general idea, intended to be conveyed by the two apostles, in the passages to be found in their epistles. It is especially observable, that Peter introduces his observation that Christ "did no sin," in close connexion with an exhortation to his fellow christians, to bear with patience the sufferings,

sufferings, which they endured after having committed no faults, or, done no sin, and after having done well. This he recommends by directing their attention to their master, who did no sin, who, for conscience towards God, endured grief, suffering wrongfully, and forbearing to return evil for evil, committed himself to him that judgeth righteously.

There is another passage* which by some may be considered as asserting the universal and absolute impeccability of Christ. But perhaps it will not well admit of so extensive an application, as one may at first imagine.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, after speaking concerning the dignity of Jesus in his state of exaltation, seems to aim at pointing out the propriety of his being a man, rather than some being of an higher order. As he was a partaker of flesh and blood and consequently of human feelings; his example in sufferings and in death, was calculated to afford encouragement to his followers, who thus may be enabled to rise superior to the slavish fear of those who possessed the power of persecution and death. "For as much, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he, also, himself partook of them completely; that by means of his own death he might counteract him who hath the power of death (that is the adversary, the persecutor), and might deliver them who, all their life, were

* Heb. iv. 15.

“ liable to slavery, through the fear of death*.”
 “ For in that he himself hath suffered, he
 “ is able to succour (to strengthen by the
 “ power of his example) them that are tempt-
 “ ed.” “ Wherefore (adds this writer) holy
 “ brethren, consider the Apostle and high
 “ Priest of our profession,”—consider the forti-
 tude with which he endured suffering, in the
 cause of truth and righteousness, and let his
 example animate you to the same manly per-
 severance. Consider Jesus, “ who was faithful
 “ to him that appointed him.”

The author of the epistle then makes a long
 digression; but returns to his subject in the
 14th verse of the 4th chapter. He resumes the
 topic, which he had considered in the former
 passages, by a brief recapitulation of what he
 therein offered. “ Seeing then that we have a
 “ great high Priest,”—“ one who is made so
 “ much better than the angels” (ch. i. v. 4.)
 “ that is passed into the heavens,”—“ who is
 “ seated on the right hand of the Majesty on
 “ high” (ch. i. v. 3.) “ Jesus the *Son* of God,”
 superior to Moses “ the *servant*” (ch. iii.)
 “ let us hold fast our profession.” “ For we
 “ have not an high Priest, who cannot be
 “ touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but
 “ was in all points tempted like as we are,”
 “ it behoved him to be made in all things like
 “ unto his brethren, that he might be a mer-
 “ ciful and faithful high Priest, that being

* See this passage finely illustrated in Theol. Repos.
 vol. v. p. 101.

“tempted, he might be able to succour them that are tempted” (ch. ii. v. 17, 18.) for though he was tempted, he was “without sin,”—“he was faithful to him, that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house” (ch. iii. v. 2.) though he, like us, was a partaker of flesh and blood, though he was naturally susceptible of pain, though he was subject to the fear of death, he was not overcome by the prospect of it, but was firm and unshaken in his allegiance to the cause of truth and virtue. The contemplation of him was admirably adapted to afford them “help,” encouragement, and strength, “in the time of need,” when they, like their great master, were encompassed by their enemies, and tempted by persecution, to apostatize from their profession.

This appears to be the meaning of the passage; and, if it really be so, it must be evident that all which can naturally and justly be inferred from the expression of his being “without sin,” is, that the severest sufferings were unable to move him from his adherence to the glorious cause in which he was engaged. One would not be positive; but it very much appears, from the 3d verse of the next chapter, as if the writer of the epistle really considered Christ, on account of his being a priest taken from among frail men, as being under a necessity, by reason of his infirmity, “as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sins.”

A similar idea seems to be introduced towards the end of the seventh chapter where* he says

Heb. vii. 27.

that

that Jesus, who being made perfect through sufferings is "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not *daily*," from time to time; "as those high-priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this *he did once*, when he offered up himself," in consequence of which offering "he is consecrated" or perfected "for evermore."

It may not be amiss to notice an expression of the apostle John's, which may be thought to favour the notion of our Lord's absolute impeccability. "And we know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin*," i. e. *now* in his exalted and perfected state: for he immediately adds "*whosoever* abideth in him, sinneth not," and he had just before observed, that "when he shall appear *we shall be like him*," and that "*every* man, who hath this hope in him purifieth himself *even as he is pure*."

So much would not have been said upon this subject, but that the question concerning the peccability of Christ, has been yet but little agitated: so that almost any observations how unimportant soever in themselves may become of real utility, and be the indirect means of throwing some valuable light upon the controversy. They may be so fortunate as to strike upon some happy key in the mind of some other person, and thus may lead him to impart to us

* 1 John iii. 5.

such ideas as shall fill us with the most agreeable conceptions of the harmony of christianity.

One would cautiously avoid encouraging any unjustly low apprehensions of the great author of our faith. But it appears to me that whilst we give up the natural impeccability of Christ, we must necessarily feel a warmer affection for him, and an higher admiration of that virtue which was tried and perfected by *real* temptations. And surely, the probability of the gospel history, with which every fact and doctrine relating to our religion is so intimately connected, is of much greater importance to be defended, than any sentiment concerning the natural powers and endowments of any one, employed in its publication.

An Enquiry into the Time, at which the Kingdom of Heaven will commence.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

IN the course of my enquiry concerning the Elijah foretold by Malachi, I was led to question the two-fold acceptation of the term *kingdom of God*, adopted by Mr. Taylor; who says (on the Apostacy Pt. 1st. p. 179.) ‘As his (Christ’s) first parousia was to set up *the kingdom*’

'dom of God in Judea, foretold by Daniel, chap. ii. so his second parousia will be, to extend this kingdom *under himself, as king over all*; and set up an universal empire, according to the same prophet, chap. vii.' He makes the same distinction, p. 177, between 'the kingdom of God,' which the Father was to set up during the reign of the beasts, Dan. ii. and 'the kingdom of Christ.' But I look upon it, that there is only one event predicted in these two passages of Daniel; 'The establishment of the kingdom of God and his Christ, at the second coming of the latter, in the clouds of heaven:' that this kingdom is still, as it was at the first preaching of Jesus, only *approaching*: and that the present *moral* reign of God over the hearts of men, is never mentioned in scripture under that idea.

The preaching of Christ and his apostles, was intended to *prepare* subjects, who were either to be alive at their Lord's coming; and enter into this kingdom of righteousness, after the great change mentioned by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 51. Phil. iii. 21. 1 Thess. iv. 17. or, to be raised from the dead; and, in reward of their virtue, be admitted members of this millenary state. But that Christ, either at his first preaching, at his resurrection, or his transfiguration, or the descent of the spirit on the day of Pentecost, either completely, or in part, erected what is universally intended in scripture, by *the kingdom of God*, I do not persuade myself: as I believe that phrase, to convey the uncompounded idea of the government to be set up, when he shall hereafter come in the clouds.

The words of Daniel, ii. 44. are, 'In the days of these kings' (a time still future, as the polarchy arising out of the Roman empire, denoted by the toes of this image, and the ten horns of the beast, chap. vii. is at present subsisting) 'In the days of these kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people; but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms; and shall stand fast for ever.' Again, chap. vii. 9. 'I beheld till the thrones were placed (^{etc. See} LXX. Mede's works, p. 762. Mordecai's Apol. i. 587.) and the ancient of days did sit—I beheld even till the beast was slain—I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of a Man—and there was given him dominion and glory, &c.' Now both the kingdom that the God of heaven is to set up, and that which is to be given to the Son of Man, when he comes in the clouds, are to succeed the Roman empire: and the former, Dan. ii. is to *break in pieces* the rest. Whence I think it evident, that they are both temporal, earthly kingdoms; and that the former, especially, Dan. ii. cannot be a merely spiritual one. Nor do I perceive the authority from which Mr. Taylor has collected that the kingdom mentioned Dan. ii. was to be set up *in Judea*.

Mr. Mede, likewise, is of opinion (Works, p. 743) that 'The image points out two states of the kingdom of Christ: the first to be while those times of the kingdoms of the Gentiles lasted, typified by a stone hewn out of a mountain, without hands, the monarchical statue yet standing

standing upon his feet; the second not to be until the utter destruction and dissipation of the image: when the stone, having smote it upon the feet, should grow into a great mountain, which should fill the whole earth. The first may be called *Regnum Lapidis*, which is the state of Christ's kingdom which hath hitherto been; the other, *Regnum Montis*, which is the state of his kingdom which shall hereafter be. Note here, that the stone was hewn out of the mountain, before it smote the image upon the feet; and consequently, before the image was dissipated; and, therefore, *the kingdom typified by the stone while it remained a stone*, must needs be within the times of those monarchies, i. e. before the last of them, i. e. the Roman, should expire. But how does it appear that the stone became a kingdom for any considerable period, *before* it smote the image? we are told, ver. 35. that the stone that (had already) smote the image, became a great mountain, the usual emblem of a *kingdom*. Besides the kingdom which Christ is supposed at present to have established, is of a *different nature* from that which he will erect when he comes with power, as being purely *spiritual*; whereas the stone, and the mountain are homogeneous, and therefore cannot be thought to represent two such heterogeneous dominions.

This learned author farther observes, that Daniel's vision of the four beasts omits the first state of Christ's kingdom, the *Regnum Lapidis*; for which he assigns a reason that will not be satisfactory to every reader, viz. that 'Nebuchad-

‘ nezzar a Gentile, was a type of the Gentiles ;
 ‘ who were to have their part in both estates of
 ‘ Christ’s kingdom ; wherefore both are shewn
 ‘ him. Daniel a Jew, was a type of the Jews ;
 ‘ whose nation should have no share in the first ;
 ‘ and therefore only the last was shewn him.’
 But that the Jews were to have no share in the
 gospel till the establishment of the *Regnum Montis*,
 at the coming of Christ, is evidently a mistake.
 In their individual capacity they were converted,
 just as were the Gentiles ; and of individuals, *as*
such, the kingdom of Christ must consist. For I
 cannot look upon *national* conversions as in any
 sense the establishment of Christ’s dominion.
 Now the omission of the mention of the *Regnum*
Lapidis, in the vision of the beasts, is, one would
 think, a sufficient intimation that we were mis-
 taken in supposing it was pointed out in the
 vision of the image ; especially as no better rea-
 son can be assigned for this omission, than that
 proposed by our author.

The truth of the case seems to be, that the
 days of these kings are not yet expired, that the
stone is not yet become a *kingdom* ; nor will be-
 come one, till the coming of the Son of Man, at
 the seventh trumpet, in the clouds of heaven ;
 when, and not before, the kingdoms of the earth
 are to become the kingdoms of Jehovah and of his
 Christ, Apoc. xi. 15. and that the only difference
 in the representations given by the two visions, is
 this : In the vision of the image, the *means* by
 which God will destroy the Roman empire are
 pointed out, viz. by a *stone cut out of a mountain*
 (and it must necessarily be *cut out*, before it can
smite

smite the image) without hands, that is, by a miraculous power, which will be displayed by the Son of Man, when he cometh with his retinue in the clouds of heaven*: In the vision of the beasts, the *succession* only of the two empires is noted, viz. *after* the Roman empire is judged, condemned, and destroyed, the kingdom over all will be given, in the next place, to the Son of Man. In this vision, the instruments employed in completing the overthrow of the fourth beast, are not told us. Nor is it asserted that the stone was cut out before the division of the empire into the pollarchy. For the feet of the image are represented as subsisting before the stone was seen, ch. ii. 33, 34. 41. They are represented as consisting part of iron, and part of clay; a compound that denotes *division, strength impaired, and a mixture with barbarous nations*. Whence we may collect, that the stone was not cut out in the time of Augustus, or his successor; when the empire was undivided, its strength unimpaired, and not yet in want of alliances with foreign nations, nor distracted by their incursions. See Bishop Newton's Dissert. i. 419, 8vo. ' Then (after the days of Theodosius the Great) ' by the incursion of many northern nations, ' they brake into many smaller kingdoms; which ' are represented by the feet and toes of the ' image, composed part of iron, and part of ' clay.' Sir Isaac Newton on Dan. p. 26. So again in the interpretation, the kingdom to be set up, is not mentioned, till after the division

* Compare Apoc. xix. 11. 20. xi. 15. 18.

and

and weaknesses of the Romans, and the admission of the northern nations. Neither is it suggested, v. 34. that any long interval elapsed, between the cutting out of the stone, and its smiting the image.

Is it not, also, a contradiction to assert, that 'Daniel expounds the *stone*, as that *lasting* kingdom the God of Heaven should set up; that kingdom which should not be destroyed, nor left to other people; but should break in pieces, and consume all those kingdoms, and itself shall stand fast for ever;' and at the same time, to maintain that the prophet 'expounds not the stone's becoming a mountain?' (Mede, p. 744.) Surely what our learned author imagines to be the description of the *Regnum Lapidis*, includes and supersedes every thing that can be predicated of the *Regnum Montis*. I cannot therefore think, with Mr. Mede, that the 44th verse is spoken as the interpretation of the *stone*, exclusively of its becoming a *mountain*. The clause appears to run thus: 'In the days of these kings, the God of Heaven shall set up a kingdom (originating indeed in a stone, but soon becoming a mountain) which shall never be destroyed, nor left to another people; but it shall break in pieces, and consume all those kingdoms; and shall stand fast for ever: (45.) just as* thou sawest that a stone was cut out of a mountain; and that it brake in pieces, the iron, the clay, the silver, and the gold.' All this is not spoken as the interpretation of the

* כל קבל די, Propterea quod. οὐσποσων. LXX. Secundum quod. Vulg. עון אשר Hebrew. For which reason.

stone,

stone, distinguished from the mountain; but includes both the former and the latter states of the kingdom. Nor is the stone mentioned in the 45th verse, with any other view, than to illustrate the manner in which the empires of the world should be *crushed* by that of Christ. Nor, as I observed before, is it probable, that a kingdom merely spiritual, an empire over the hearts and inclinations of men, should be compared to a stone, which should grind to powder the arm of flesh, the potentates of the earth.

That the state of Christ's church, therefore, which our author here calls *Regnum Lapidis*, and *militant kingdom*, p. 104, is ever denominated in scripture by the title, *kingdom of God*, or *of heaven*, is an assertion, that derives, I think, no support from this prophecy.

It may be thought, that what occurs, Dan. ix. 25. is sufficient to establish the hypothesis, namely, 'From the going forth of the commandment unto *Messiah the Prince*, shall be seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks;' as if, at the end of this period, the person here intended was to become the Messiah, the prince; and be established on his throne. But the prediction, allowing, what I very much doubt at present, that its object is Jesus, and his kingdom, may be understood to mean no more, than that from the going forth of the commandment, to the time of him, *who should afterwards be the Prince*, sixty-nine weeks should elapse. And it is remarkable, that the grand, personal, final circumstance, foretold in this prophecy, concerning the Messiah, is, that he should be *cut off*, and not

not that he should in any sense, begin to *reign*, which naturally leads one to imagine, that the season of his setting up an everlasting kingdom is not by any means determined in this passage.

The reasons which incline me to think the militant state of the gospel is never called *the kingdom of God*, in any proper sense, are the following:

First, Because I do not find, in scripture, any such distinction as that of *militant* and *triumphant*, *perfect* and *imperfect* kingdom. To the term *kingdom of God*, the Jews annexed one determinate and precise idea, the reign of the Messiah; and had our Lord, in his conversations with them, intended any thing different from what they did, it cannot be supposed but he would have told them so most expressly; and not have suffered it to be gathered from scattered passages and implications. They might mistake the *spirit* of his government and constitutions, as consistent with policy, worldly-mindedness, and unrighteousness; but could not be so far left in ignorance, as to suppose it a literal dominion, when in truth it was only a figurative one; or an earthly empire, when it was really a heavenly one. Nor is the distinction mentioned by Mr. Taylor, p. 177. of the coming of the Son of man in *his own* kingdom, and in *God's* kingdom, less imaginary. For when he cometh in the glory of *his Father*, it will be with the angels; and he will then reward every man according to his work (Mat. xvi. 27. Mark viii. 38.) which is the same event that will happen, when he cometh in *his own* glory,
Mat,

Mat. xxv. 31. Luke ix. 26. expresses the time, 'when he shall come in *his own* glory, and in ' *his Father's*, and of the holy angels,' after which follows as an equivalent, 'there be some ' standing here, who shall not taste death till ' they see the *kingdom of God*.' 'When the Son ' of man shall have sent forth his angels, and ' gathered out of *his kingdom* all things that ' offend,—the righteous shall shine in the king- ' dom of *their Father*,' Mat. xiii. 41. 43. Luke xix. 11. when the Jews thought that the *king- dom of God* should immediately appear, our Lord represents it under the image of that which a nobleman received (he means *himself*) after he had been into a far country (after he had been some time in heaven). Note: the first act of our Lord, after having received this kingdom, is described as the distribution of rewards and punishments. By comparing the occasion of this parable with Mat. xxv. 13. (in the original) we shall see, that *the kingdom of God* is synonymous to the *coming of the Son of man*. Mat. xxiv. 33. 'So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these ' things, know that *he* (Christ) is near, even at ' the doors.' The parallel place. Luke xxi. 31. is,—'know ye that the *kingdom of God* is nigh at ' hand.' Mat. xix. 23. we read, 'A rich man ' shall hardly enter into *the kingdom of Heaven*,' the same idea is expressed, ver. 24.—'A rich ' man to enter into *the kingdom of God*,' and ver. 28. the same state of recompence is stiled the time when 'the Son of man shall sit on the ' throne of his glory.' Paul says, Eph. v. 5. 'No whoremonger hath any inheritance in *the* ' *kingdom*

'*kingdom of Christ, and of God,*' and 2 Tim. iv. 1. he writes, 'I charge thee before God; and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing, and his kingdom.' Whence we may argue that the kingdom of Christ, his appearance, and (in Paul's idea) the judgment of the quick and the dead, were synchronous. And from the whole of the above paragraph, we may collect, that the kingdom of God, the kingdom of Christ, the coming of Christ, and his appearance in the clouds, with the angels, in glory, are synonymous expressions.

Secondly, We are never told in any part of the sacred writings, except the Apocalypse, that the kingdom of God is actually, even in part, set up. In all the accounts we have of the birth, ministry, transfiguration, ascension, of our Lord, we are never informed, that the event is positively arrived. When Christ promised the spirit, John xvi, and when Peter discoursed upon its descent, on the day of Pentecost, we are not told that this was the period of the erection of *the kingdom*; on the contrary after our Lord had assured the Apostles, they should be baptized with the holy spirit not many days hence, after not many of *those days*; their next question is, Lord wilt thou at *that time* (for *χρὸς ταῦτα* refers to *ταῦτας ἡμέρας*) restore the kingdom unto Israel: evidently shewing they did not suppose the two phrases to denote the same event. To which our Lord replies, 'It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father hath put in his own power;' *i. e.* the time

time of erecting the kingdom; plainly distinguishing between that period which God kept in his own power, and the baptism with the spirit, to be accomplished not many days afterwards.

Nor do I think we have reason to conclude with Mr. Taylor, p. 179. that 'if the disciples were witnesses of Christ's powerful presence, and of his glory, as of the only begotten of the Father; and beheld his Majesty' [*μεγαλειότης*, *greatness*, 2 Pet. i. 16.] 'and heard a voice from heaven declaring him to be the Son of God,' they did behold him 'coming in that kingdom of God he was to set up.' Nor did 'his miracles testify a *regal* power,' without his express declaration. They were only signs of a divine commission, which many prophets appealed to besides himself. All we learn is, that Jesus is the Christ, the person appointed, in future times, to sit on the throne of David; to come in the clouds of heaven. Our daily prayer is still, that God's kingdom may *come*; not be *perfected*, as if in part already established. In the epistolary writings, this kingdom is represented as something future, 1 Cor. vi. 9. Gal. v. 21. Eph. v. 5. and James ii. 5. represents the poor as heirs of the kingdom God hath *promised*. And among all the metaphors by which St. Paul describes the relation between Jesus and his disciples, he never adopts that of *king* and *subjects*; nor represents either elders or deacons, as *officers in a kingdom*.

Thirdly, Our Lord has told us that several events, the destruction of Jerusalem, the persecution of his disciples, &c. should precede the establishment,

establishment of the kingdom of God, or the coming of the Son of man. Compare Mat. xxiv. 7. 9. 15. 21. 30. 33. with Luke xxi. 10. 12. 20. 25. 27. 31. And Paul asserts, that before the *day of Christ* the man of sin should be revealed, and be destroyed *at his coming*, 2 Theff. ii. 2. 8.

Fourthly, The first intimation in the order of events, that the kingdom of God is arrived, occurs Apoc. xii. 10. where, upon the ejection of the dragon out of heaven; *i. e.* upon Pagan idolatry being no longer the religion of the empire; a voice exclaims, 'Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ.' Not that I imagine the true sense even of this passage to be, that the everlasting kingdom of God, alluded to in the gospels, and predicted by Daniel, came at this time; as I shall hereafter endeavour to shew. Nor have I any opinion that Constantine's establishments can in any light be called a kingdom of CHRIST. I think, however, we may be sure of this, that the scriptural kingdom of God was not established before his time.

Fifthly, It is expressly said, 1 Cor. xv. 50. that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Whence it may be inferred, that this kingdom will not be inherited or established, before the great change Paul mentions, in the two next verses. Conformably to Mat. xxv. 34. where the righteous are commanded to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, at the coming of the Son of man in his glory, and not before, ver. 31.

But there are many texts of scripture, that, at first sight, appear utterly subversive of my hypothesis. The first I shall mention, is Mat. xii. 28. 'If I by the spirit of God cast out demons, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.' Now I only wish our Lord's words to be understood consistently with other parts of the discourse; and in such a manner as to form a rational argument. He had been casting out a demon; and the people said, 'Is not this the son of David?' [Luke's account, xi. 16. is, that some, tempting him, sought of him a sign, or the grand sign of his descent, from heaven.] But the Pharisees said, this fellow casteth not out demons, but by Beelzebub, the prince of demons. To which our Lord replies; first, that it would be absurd to suppose he was assisted by Beelzebub: for the prince would never co-operate with any one, in dispossessing and defeating his own subjects. Secondly, He asks, by whose assistance did the disciples* of the Pharisees, supposing their exorcisms to be real, cast out demons, but by that of the God of Abraham? and if they did it by *God's* assistance, why might not he? Then he adds, 'Now if I cast out demons, and do it by the *finger of God*, you may be assured that the kingdom of God, and not that of Beelzebub, is now upon you:' *i. e.* the natural kingdom of God, exercised over the bodies and persons of men; of which the cure of this demoniac was a proof. Just as the miracle performed on Nebuchadnezzar, con-

* See Farmer on Miracles, p. 393.

vinced him that *the heavens* did rule, Dan. iv. 25, 26. 34. What follows confirms this interpretation: 'How can one enter into a strong man's house, except he first bind the strong man?' *i. e.* how could I eject this demon, except by being first made superior to him in strength, and overcoming him. What I have done then plainly shews that I have bound and disarmed Beelzebub, instead of being assisted by him; and as 'whosoever is not with me, is against me,' so, as Beelzebub cannot be supposed to *assist* me, you may be sure he is an absolute enemy.

That the kingdom of God means his natural kingdom, his supremacy in general, and not the particular kingdom of the Messiah, is plain; because otherwise our Lord must have made an unguarded concession, in allowing the reality (though only for argument's sake) of the pharisaical exorcisms. His casting out a demon could, of itself, be no more a proof of the arrival of the Messiah's kingdom, than their doing it. It could be no better proof, than the ejection of Saul's evil spirit, by the playing of David, 1 Sam. xvi. 23. Again, our Lord does not appeal to miracles in general, as a proof that God's kingdom was come; but merely to the cure of the demoniac: which could only shew his power over imaginary evil spirits. Besides, had he appealed to miracles in general, their exhibition would, of itself, have only proved the divine commission of him who wrought them; and our Lord could not have deduced the arrival of the Messiah's kingdom, as a particular
inference,

inference, unavoidably following from them. Lastly, it may be supposed this verse alludes to the title *Son of David*, given him by the multitude Mat. xii. 23. or to *the sign* demanded Luke xi. 16. And if he understood them as wishing to know when the kingdom of God came, what could be more proper than to tell them, that they were at that time, in a general sense, under the kingdom of God; of which, the ejection of this demon was a proof. This might be said, without giving cause to suspect, that the Messiah's kingdom began with the mission of our Lord; and with a design of silencing the Jews, as was frequently the case, without giving them any direct satisfaction.

The xiiith of Matthew contains several parables which it will be necessary to consider. Let us begin with that of the Tares, ver. 24. 'The kingdom of heaven* is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field.' Here neither the sower, nor the seed, nor the field, is represented by the kingdom of heaven: for, as we see, ver. 38. the field is the world, in which the Son of man preached, in order to set up a kingdom at some future time. His preaching, that of his apostles, and that of his ministers at present, is only preparatory to the introduction

* So called from its being that which the God of heaven will set up on earth, Dan. ii. 44. by means of a Son of man, coming in the clouds of heaven; an idea very different from that of a government over spirits, in regions above the atmosphere! A state like this last mentioned, our present disquisitions on matter and spirit, and our improved Astronomy, render daily more improbable.

of that kingdom. Ver. 25. 'But while men
 ' slept, his enemy came, and sowed tares among
 ' the wheat, and went his way. But when the
 ' blade was sprung up, then appeared the tares
 ' also. So the servants of the household came,
 ' and said unto him, Sir, didst thou not sow
 ' good seed in thy field? whence then hath it
 ' tares? He said unto them, an enemy hath
 ' done this. The servants said unto him, wilt
 ' thou then that we go and gather them up?
 ' But he said, nay: lest while ye gather up the
 ' tares, ye root up also the wheat with them.
 ' Let both grow together till the harvest; and
 ' in the time of harvest, I will say to the re-
 ' pers, gather ye together first the tares, and
 ' bind them in bundles to burn them; but
 ' gather the wheat into my barn.' The *harvest*
 is the circumstance to which the kingdom of
 heaven is compared; and not any thing prior to
 that event. Just as the coming of the Son of
 man is made to introduce that occurrence, Mat.
 xvi. 27. xxv. 31. Mark viii. 38. Luke ix. 26.
 Accordingly, in the explanation, the good seed
 are said to be the children of the kingdom, *i. e.*
 those who will inherit it; the harvest, the end
 of the age, which was supposed synchronous to
 the coming of Christ, Mat. xxiv. 3. and the
 angels, the reapers.

In the application, nothing previous to the
 general judgment is considered; when the Son
 of man shall send forth his angels, and gather
 out of the field, *then* become his kingdom, all
 things that offend. At that time shall the
 righteous shine forth as the Sun, in the kingdom

of their Father. Nothing in this parable leads us to imagine that the kingdom of heaven was to begin, till the coming of the Son of man. And we must observe that Jesus has given no notice of any of the events that other prophets have told us of, as intervening between his coming and the general judgment; such as the *first* resurrection, and the millenium, Apoc. xx.

I cannot help noting, that the truly excellent and venerable Bishop Hoadly, in his answer to the Dean of Worcester, p. 102. appears to have fallen into a slight mistake, when, commenting upon ver. 41. he says, 'I would beg to know what better sense we can put upon the words *his kingdom* (that is, Christ's kingdom) than to interpret it of his church, the society of his professed disciples, or *subjects*, and whether it is not out of this society, planted in this world, that our Lord professes these workers of iniquity shall be gathered.' The Bishop considers the church, as having been from its first establishment, the *kingdom* of Christ; and the disciples, as always his subjects. Whereas in truth it appears, that our Lord will not properly *reign*, till his coming in the clouds of heaven.

The parable of the grain of mustard seed, ver. 31. and of the leaven, ver. 33. shew the silent rise of the kingdom, to the highest pinnacle of greatness, from the smallest beginnings. And thus the second coming of Christ may be the consequence of nothing more than the preaching of himself and the twelve apostles. But this no more proves that his kingdom was actually erected when he began to preach, than that his second parousia in glory, commenced with his first in

humility: or that the grain of mustard seed became a tree, when it began to vegetate. The principle, that would in time give birth to the kingdom, might long operate and *ferment*, before that kingdom came into actual existence. This is plainly expressed, Mark iv. 26—29.

‘ So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should
 ‘ cast seed into the ground, and should sleep,
 ‘ and should rise night and day, and the seed
 ‘ should spring and grow up he knoweth not
 ‘ how, For the earth bringeth forth fruit of
 ‘ herself, first the blade, then the ear, after that,
 ‘ the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit
 ‘ is brought forth [when the kingdom is arrived]
 ‘ *immediately* he putteth in the sickle, because
 ‘ the harvest is come.’

In the parable of the net, ver. 47. the period of Christ's coming with the angels, is expressly pointed out, by the casting the net into the sea, and *gathering* of every kind. And when it was full [*i. e.* when all nations shall be *gathered* before the Son of man, Mat. viii. 11. xxiv. 31. xxv. 32. Luke xiiij. 29. Apoc. xx. 12.] they drew it to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away.

The parables of the treasure, ver. 44. and of the pearl, ver. 46. were only uttered to shew the exquisite value of an inheritance in the kingdom of heaven; in competition with which, all earthly possessions were vile: and that all sub-lunary goods, might well be spared by those who had procured it.

It must be observed that in the parable of the sower, ver. 3—23. which represents the state of trial and improvement under the gospel, no
 mention

mention is made of the kingdom of heaven, by way of comparison. Our Lord indeed tells the disciples that to them it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, ver. 11. by which he means those religious truths that related to the method men must take in order to arrive at those excellencies which would qualify them for the reward of the kingdom; and what particular descriptions of men would make use of, or neglect their opportunities. But there is not the least intimation that, during their probation, they were subjects of the kingdom of heaven.

In the parable of the king taking an account of his servants, the kingdom of heaven is represented as the season of retribution, Mat. xviii. 23. 35.

Mat. xx. 1. In the parable of the labourers the similarity of the kingdom of heaven does not commence till ver. 8. when *even* was come; and every man received a penny. The householder's going into the market place, is only preparatory to his paying the wages; as the call into the church, or congregation of Christians, is preparatory to their entrance into the kingdom: and it can by no means be proved from hence, that the vineyard, the state of probation, is designed to represent the kingdom; on the contrary, it is plain that the kingdom of heaven, in this place, does not mean the church militant, from the use of the phrase in the sense of the state of retribution, ch. xix. 23—29.

With respect to the parable itself, I would propose a different interpretation of it from any

I have seen. It follows the circumstance of our Lord's saying, 'How hardly shall a rich man enter the kingdom of heaven,' xix. 23. *Every one* who hath left houses, or lands, &c. shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit eternal life, 29. Now many that are first [in present rank and dignity] shall be last [in the kingdom of heaven] and *vice versa*. In this connexion, I imagine those who were hired first into the vineyard, were those whom any one would choose, from their robust appearance, in preference to the rest, as being able to bear the heat and burden of the day, ver. 12. and that those who were hired late, were the refuse, the sickly, and the weak; whom no one would engage till he was forced, ver. 7.

From the connexion in which it stands, I apprehend the parable intended to shew, that whatever is men's present external condition, their treatment in the kingdom of heaven, *ceteris paribus*, will be the same*: and not that all persons professing Christianity, provided they be duly qualified in a moral light, will get to heaven, *whatever the time of their call*: or, as Dr. Macknight says, p. 443. 'that the Jewish nation, who of all people were first in respect of external privileges; and particularly in respect of the offer; should be the last in receiving the gospel; and when they did receive it, should enjoy no higher privileges under it, than the Gentiles who were called at the 11th

* *Every one* that hath left houses, &c. shall receive eternal life, xix. 29.

'hour.' In the view of the parable I have suggested, the murmuring of those who were called first, *i. e.* the rich, whose outward appearance in this world was likely to gain them the first attention, is the natural consequence of their supposing themselves degraded, by being reduced to a level, with such as from their unpromising exterior, no man would hire. And the circumstance of their bearing the heat and burden of the day, is explained by the greater sacrifices of external advantages which the rich may make above others. The young man, *xix.* 22. had great possessions; and consequently might expect by selling all he had, to inherit a higher station in the kingdom: but is told he would not be recompensed above the apostles, who had equally left their ALL. The parable is connected with what precedes, by the particle, *For*.

The parable of the marriage supper, *Mat.* *xxii.* 2. may be illustrated by *Apoc.* *xix.* 7—9. *xxi.* 9. This does not commence till after the second coming of Christ. The misbehaviour of those who were first invited, their neglect of the opportunities of improvement, is previous to the entertainment. And the going out of the servants, to gather as many as they found, is the going forth of the angels to gather both the wheat, and the tares; the ejection of him who had not the wedding garment, the punishment of the wicked, and their expulsion from that society, into which no unclean thing shall enter, *Apoc.* *xxi.* 8. 27.

The

The same is the case with the parable of the ten virgins, Mat. xxv. 1. in which the sudden coming of the bridegroom, is professedly designed to represent the second advent of the Son of man; and consequently the marriage, or kingdom of heaven, does not commence till that period.

Mat. xxv. 13—30. The kingdom of heaven is illustrated by the parable of the ten talents. It is indeed so illustrated only in our translation; for ver. 14. *the kingdom of heaven* is not mentioned in the original. The allegory commences from, ‘The day and the hour wherein the Son of man cometh. At that time proceedings will be regulated as they were, when a man, who went on a journey, after having entrusted his servants with several talents, *returned*, and *reckoned with them.*’ Our translators have not improperly supplied the term, *kingdom of heaven*, as it is synonymous to the coming of the Son of man; but since they inserted it unwarranted by the original, this passage belongs not to our subject.

Mat. xvi. 19. Our Lord promises to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven: by which, rational expositors understand no more, than that he was to be the first preacher of the gospel, both to Jews and Gentiles, after its grand confirmation. It may seem probable therefore that, in this text, the kingdom of heaven is synonymous to the present profession of Christianity. But I answer that faith in the Lord Jesus was the appointed method by which all men were to become

become subjects of the kingdom of heaven, when it should be afterwards established: and the hopes of that inheritance, men's inducement to be converted. Peter therefore, by being the first preacher of the means, might be said to open a door to the end. In this sense also the Pharisees shut up the kingdom of heaven, xxiii. 13. by using all their diligence, that no persons should prepare themselves for it, by becoming our Lord's disciples. The same may be said of Mat. xi. 12. 'From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven is suffering violence,' by the entrance of such numbers into the preparatory state of becoming disciples, in order to besiege it. And in general, preaching the kingdom of God, the gospel, or glad tidings of the kingdom, means, declaring that it was at hand, Mat. iii. 2. iv. 17. and proclaiming the course of action necessary to obtain it.

Mat. xxviii. 18. 'All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.' This phrase I think, must be limited to the affairs of the church, distinguished from, and exclusively of the Messiah's kingdom: for our Lord says in the next verse, Go ye *therefore*, and *teach* all nations. Now it appears that immediately before his ascension, Jesus, so far from being at that time elevated to his kingdom of Israel, did not know when it was to be erected. Acts i. 7. the apostles however were soon to receive *power*, and to become witnesses: whence it should seem that ALL POWER, used by Matthew, means only an ability to impart spiritual gifts for the propagation

propagation of the gospel. Or, the meaning of the place may be, that all power was now *settled upon* Christ, and nothing could hinder his future receiving it, as his trial and conquest were passed, he was the appointed Messiah who should come in his proper time.

Mark xi. 10. It may be thought, that the exclamations of the multitude upon our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, 'Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord; blessed be the king of Israel, that cometh in the name of the Lord,' Luke xix. 38. John xii. 13. prove his accession at that time to the throne. I answer, that this was only a piece of symbolical instruction by action; similar to his driving the money changers out of the temple (See Bishop Hurd's illustration of that transaction, serm. at Lincoln's-Inn, vol. i.) and to his curse of the barren fig-tree. The multitude, convinced by his miracles that he was the Messiah, Luke xix. 37. and, as John describes it, xii. 18. particularly by the resurrection of Lazarus, came to meet him, proclaiming him the expected king of Israel. His entrance into the city in a regal character, was no more than an acknowledgment of the title they had bestowed upon him; a declaration, that whenever the kingdom of God came, he was to be the person who should bear rule in it.

Luke xvii, 21. 'The kingdom of God is within you.' This text is looked upon as decisive that the Messiah's militant *kingdom* was at that time established. But we must observe that Jesus had been asked, when the kingdom of
God

God should come; *ερχεται*, in the present tense. He answered, 'the kingdom of God cometh not (*ερχεται*) with observation, i. e. you must not look abroad for it; nor shall they say, lo! here, or lo! there: for behold, the kingdom of God is (will be) *within* you; when it comes, it will in a great measure consist of internal qualifications which its subjects must possess. You will do better by cultivating in your hearts the holiness, godliness, and charity required in that kingdom, than by observing the outward signs of its approach.' I render *ερχεται* future, only in conformity with *ερχεται*: and do not think that this text asserts the kingdom of God to be already COME.

John iii. 3. 5. 'Except a man be born from above—of water, and of the spirit, he cannot see (enter into) the kingdom of God.' I was once of opinion, that the expression *kingdom of God* in these places, meant the church, the present profession of christianity. But as I am convinced that being *born from above, of water, and of the spirit*, signify being proselyted to a *heavenly* religion, and being *baptized* in consequence of a *miraculous* interposition, I am prevented understanding any thing by the kingdom of God, besides what Nicodemus did, the kingdom of the Messiah, at our Lord's second coming. Nothing in this conversation informs us, of the time when this kingdom would be erected. All we learn is, that Nicodemus must prepare himself for it, by being baptised, *i. e.* by relinquishing judaism, and embracing christianity, on the credit of its proper proofs.

John.

John xviii. 36. If it be thought that this text implies that Christ's kingdom was purely spiritual, to be set up in the hearts of men, and consequently established by the *preaching* of Jesus, I answer, that the text appears not to me to warrant the conclusion. Pilate, having heard the malicious accusation of the Jews, asks Jesus, 'Art thou the king of the Jews?' Jesus replies, by asking, 'Dost thou say this of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?' Pilate answered, 'Am I a Jew? thy own nation, and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me, what hast thou done?' Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants contend, that I should not be delivered unto the Jews: but now my kingdom is not from hence.' As if he had said, 'You need not be apprehensive about the authority of Rome over this province from any efforts of mine; for my kingdom, whatever its nature, and whenever it arrives, will not be supported by means of men's rebelling against the civil governments they live under, and proclaiming me their king; but by an immediate exertion of omnipotence*, which the potentates

* Your correspondent Pamphilus (vol. v. p. 213, 310.) persuades himself that as the prophecies speak of nothing but *temporal prosperity*, and our Saviour expressly declares, *his kingdom is not of this world*, the *Messiah*, and the *temporal prince*, are two persons. But I must observe, that the chief part of the Messiahship of Jesus seems to consist in his *reigning* in the millenary kingdom, after his coming in the clouds: that his kingdom will then be *temporal*, as he is to
reign

‘ of this world will find it vain to oppose. If
 ‘ my kingdom were to arise from the attempts
 ‘ of men to set me upon the throne of Israel, I
 ‘ should certainly have servants to contend, and
 ‘ rescue me from the power of the Romans, or
 ‘ the malice of the Jews. But as this is not the
 ‘ case, you may be assured my kingdom will
 ‘ not be erected by the powers of this world.’

Compare the description of the stone cut out of the mountain, without hands, *i. e.* not by human means, which became itself a great mountain, Dan. ii. 34.

Pilate answered him, ‘ Art thou a king then?’ Jesus answered, ‘ Thou sayest that I am a king?’ *i. e.* This is a title by which you, and my accusers may call me if you please (all I at present profess concerning myself is that) for this cause was I born, and came into the world, that

reign a thousand years (at the end of which he will be subject to him that put all things under him, 1 Cor. xv. 24. 28. Rev. xx. 4.) and an *earthly government*, as appears from Daniel’s description of its crushing other kingdoms. This is not contradicted by our Lord’s saying that his kingdom is not *ἐκ τῆ κοσμοῦ τῆς*, *of, or from this world*; *ἐν*, *from hence*; which alludes only to the manner of its establishment and support; and not to its being a merely figurative dominion, and in fact no more than discipleship. Our Lord and his followers were not *ἐκ τῆ κοσμοῦ τῆς*, John viii. 23. xv. 19. xvii. 6. 14. 16. yet this does not imply that they had no connexion with this earth; that they were not born, and did not live, upon it. All however that I mean to maintain, is, that Christ’s expression does not preclude his being a temporal prince: I do not in the least imagine, that the prophecies Pamphilus has cited from the Old Testament in general, relate to Jesus, Rev. xi. 15. it is said, ‘ The kingdoms of *this world* are become the kingdoms of Christ.’

I might

I might bear witness to the truth. 'Every one that is of the truth, every child of truth, hear-eth, obeyeth, my voice.' Pilate saith unto him, 'What is truth?' He did not put this as an abstract metaphysical question, desiring him to explain what he meant by *truth*; but being under an evident perturbation of mind, demanded hastily, 'What is *truth* in such a case as yours?' 'You see the Jews are determined upon your destruction*, however right, or innocent you may be.' Or, 'What is *truth*, that you should put the province into confusion about it?' On saying this, he went out, and told the Jews, 'I find no fault at all in him.'

I cannot discover in this passage that Jesus calls himself at that time a king, as is presumed both by the Dean of Worcester (serm. on Heb. xiii. 17.) p. 31. and by the Bishop of Bangor, in his answer, p. 111. All I can understand from it, is, that our Lord, being asked by Pilate whether he was a king, replies, 'You may call me so if you please; all that I say of myself, is, that I have the commission of a prophet, to bear witness to the truth: and whoever has a regard to truth, will come and be my disciple. Besides, you may assure yourself that my kingdom is not of this world, and will not be established by armies, and the power of men; for if it were so, I should certainly have a guard to attempt a present rescue.'

Acts ii. 36. Peter, in his first discourse to the Jews, declares, that God had made that same Jesus, whom they crucified, both Lord and

Compare Matt. xx. vii. 24.

Christ,

Christ, *i. e.* supreme and only ruler in the church. As the affairs of the kingdom of Israel were transacted by Jehovah, and his anointed; so now Jesus was to answer both those characters; and be the only potentate in the church. Or, if the term *χριστος*, anointed, be thought more properly to refer to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, the term, 'hath made,' may be understood of designation only, prior to his entrance on his office.

It is urged by Bishop Hoadley (Answer to Dean of Worcester's serm. p. 106.) that in '1 Cor. xv. 24. Christ is said, after the general resurrection, to deliver up the kingdom to his father.' Whence his lordship argues, 'that he has a kingdom before the end of the world,—that he has now the rule of a king, and every thing essential to it; that he must therefore have under him a kingdom, a society of subjects over whom he is now properly king, and that this kingdom is his church.' But had the bishop observed, that between the coming of Christ, mentioned at the close of the 23d verse, and the end, foretold at the beginning of the 24th, the whole season of the millenium is to elapse; had he noticed that the resurrection predicted by Paul, is only that of those who are Christ's, the first resurrection, Apoc. xx. 5, he would not, perhaps, have argued from this text, that Christ had NOW the rule of a king, and that his kingdom is the church. His kingdom may not commence, till the first resurrection, and may terminate with the general one, Apoc. xx. 13. continuing through the period of the thousand

VOL. VI. T years,

years, ver. 6. without any contradiction to what Paul has asserted. The particle he uses is not *τοτε*, but *ετα*, which denotes a succession, and not a synchronism of events.

The truth appears to be, that the apostles and evangelists apprehended *that* to be the first act of Christ's regal power, which the apocalypse assures us will not take place till after he has reigned one thousand years. Whereas it seems plain that they who are Christ's at his coming, the virtuous disciples of our master, shall be reanimated at his first appearance; and that *the rest of the dead*, must remain in *statu mortuorum*, till after the thousand years are accomplished.

Ephes. i. 20.—'God's mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand, in the heavenly places; far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come; and put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church.' It may be apprehended that this text represents our Lord, as at present, in possession of his *regal* dignity. But it seems to me, to relate merely to the resurrection of Christ, his ascension, and the triumph of his religion. He is represented, as elevated to the highest post of favour and dignity, in the court of heaven, *next the sovereign*; where he must abide, till he comes hereafter to *reign himself*. Both his elevation, and his triumph over all obstacles, are only preparatory to the grand future display of his regal power,
in

in the clouds of heaven. He is represented as head over all things to the church. But, surely, this is a very different idea from that which Daniel, the evangelists, and apostles suggest, of his reigning, and dispensing rewards and punishments.

Col. i. 13. 'Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear son.' Here it may be said, that christians are called subjects of Christ's kingdom, previous to his second coming. But I look upon this as only a figurative kingdom, and to mean no more than obedience to the faith; a government of instruction and discipleship, and not the actual *kingdom* God was to set up. My reason for this supposition is, that they are said to be delivered from the authority (*ἐξουσία*) of darkness, an allegorical personage. So that the kingdom of Christ may in this place mean no more than attention to his precepts as a master. Thus also, Rom. vi. 12. 'Let not sin reign *βασιλεύειν* in your mortal bodies.'

Phil. ii. 9. In this description of Christ's dignity, it is said, that 'God hath given him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that the Lord Jesus is the Christ*, to the glory of God the Father.' Where it is plain his exaltation consists in this, that all beings should submit, in the name, and at the authority of Jesus, to God's will; and that every person should confess him to be the

* *Ὁς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.*

Christ, to the glory of the Almighty, which is by no means the idea of his being now a KING; but only Jehovah's anointed prophet, and *future* Christ. Conformable to this, is the description, Col. i. 15, of his being the creator of the new world; where his resemblance to the supreme being, and his seniority in God's family, are represented; but by no means his having attained to *regal* authority.

Heb. xii. 28. 'Wherefore we, receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved.' This may be thought to imply that the Hebrew converts had at that time received a kingdom; or that the profession of the gospel is here called a kingdom. But the passage appears to me to anticipate what they were to receive hereafter, as ver. 22. 'But ye *are come* ἐληλυθατε to Mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, &c.' which evidently relates to the future glory of christians. Παραλαβεσονται must signify that they had received it *in expectancy*. Mr. Pierce's note will illustrate the passage; 'The phrase παραλαβεσθαι βασιλειαν is not unusual in profane authors; but never, that I have observed, used, except concerning such as became kings. It seems, therefore, not so agreeable to me to explain this phrase as importing christians becoming subjects of Messiah's kingdom;—but that this is rather to be explained from places of scripture, wherein that dignity and honour is set forth to which they are,' or perhaps shall be, 'advanced; such as Rev. i. 6. *Christ has made us kings*; and ver. 10. *Thou has made us kings, and we shall reign on earth*. See 1 Pet. ii. 9.'

‘ ii. 9. Luke xii. 32. which suits with the language of Daniel, vii. 18. *The saints of the most high shall take the kingdom, παραληψόμενοι την βασιλειαν: LXX: and possess the kingdom for ever, ver. 22. the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.*’ The apostles expression was probably borrowed from the prophet; and if so, it evidently appears that he had in view the kingdom to be given to the Son of Man, at his coming in the clouds of heaven. Thus also, Apoc. i. 9, John, after saying, behold he cometh with clouds, calls himself ‘ a companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom, and patience of Jesus Christ:’ to be explained, 2 Tim. ii. 12. ‘ If we suffer, we shall also reign with him.’

1 Peter iii. 22. it is said, that Jesus ‘ is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject to, or, arranged beneath, him.’ *ὑποτάσσεν αὐτῷ. i. e. he is raised to the seat of honour in his father’s court, all other beings, of whatever dignity, being obliged to give place to him.*

Rev. xii. 10. It is said, upon the ejection of the dragon from heaven, that a voice from heaven cried out, ‘ Now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ.’ This is predictive of the destruction of paganism, by Constantine, and his successors, in the empire. That æra, therefore, may be thought the period of erecting the kingdom of God, long before the second coming of Christ. But in the eleventh chapter, verse 15, it is said, at the sounding of the seventh trumpet, and not

T 3

before,

before, 'The kingdoms of the* world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. (Some copies read *εγενετο η βασιλεια*, 'the kingdom of the world is become (the kingdom) of our Lord and his Christ). The circumstance of his reigning *for ever*, points out that this is the introduction of the everlasting kingdom; and is omitted in the other description, ch. xii. It is upon this occasion, likewise, that the elders cry out, 'Thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned, xi. 17. Whereas in the other representation, the dragon ejected, xii. 7. persecutes the woman, ver. 13. and gives the beast his power, and seat, and great authority, xiii. 2. So that the kingdom of God, and the power of Christ could not at that time be said to be established to any great degree.' I rather think that the phrases here used are not *particular*, relating to the kingdom which God was to set up by the Messiah; but that they are *general*; and that upon casting out the dragon, it was observed, 'Now is come to pass, now we have an instance of the salvation, the ability of saving, of the strength, and of the *supremacy* of our God, over idols; and of the power of his Christ, *i. e.* of the progress and influence of the christian religion (For they overcame by the blood of the lamb, and by the word of their testimony, and they loved not their lives unto death, ver. 11.)' It follows; ver. 10. as a

* Our common copies of the Greek omit *της*.

proof

proof of the supremacy of God, ‘ For the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.’ The expulsion of Satan then, and not the establishment of God’s kingdom, is the cause of this exultation. And as for the inhabitants of the earth, and of the sea, Woe is denounced against them; for the adversary was come down to them, having great wrath, because he knoweth he hath but a short time. Whence arises a strong presumption, that the kingdoms of this world did not, at that time, become the kingdom of Jehovah and his Christ.

I cannot therefore persuade myself, till I am better informed, that the present state of the gospel, or the church militant, is ever called in scripture, the kingdom of God, of Christ, or of Heaven; or that this kingdom is yet come in any literal proper sense whatever. Consequently I do not imagine the title of King, or Prince, at present, in any degree applicable to the Lord Jesus; nor that of Messiah, or Christ, any farther than as prophets are stiled *the anointed*. He will, I trust, have a right to them all, and in their fullest extent, hereafter; when he shall come in the clouds of heaven. Till that time his properest appellation appears to be this, Jesus of Nazareth, the prophet of the most High God. As for the denomination of *Priest*, that is never applied to him in scripture, except in that highly figurative epistle to the Hebrews, and can at no time have any *literal* propriety whatever.

T 4

I shall

I shall close this enquiry by producing what appear to me the principal events predicted in scripture; relative to our Lord's second coming, in a series of propositions with a few references; which I wish the reader to improve and enlarge at his leisure.

During the time of the pollarchy into which the Roman empire was divided God shall erect an earthly* kingdom, which shall destroy all kingdoms; extend itself over the whole earth, and endure for ever.—Dan. ii. 44, 45. vii. 14. 18. 22. 27. Apoc. xi. 15.

This kingdom is given to a Son of man.—Dan. vii. 13. Mat. xiii. 41, xxv. 31. Mark viii. 38. xiii. 26. xiv. 62.

The Son of man shall come to take possession of it, in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory.—Dan. vii. 13. Mat. xvi. 27. xxiv. 27. 30. xxv. 31. Mark xiii. 26. xiv. 62. Luke xvii. 24. xxi. 27. Acts i. 11. 1 Theff. iv. 16. 2 Theff. i. 7. Apoc. i. 7. xiv. 14.

His coming will be sudden.—Mal. iii. 1. Mat. xxiv. 37—44. xxv. 13. Mark xiii. 35, 36. Luke xvii. 26—31. 1 Theff. v. 2. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Apoc. iii. 3. xvi. 15.

A trumpet shall sound.—Mat. xxiv. 31. 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Theff. iv. 16. Apoc. xi. 15.

Jesus is the Son of man, the future King.—Mat. viii. 20. ix. 6. xi. 19. xii. 8. 40. xvi. 13.

* That the reign of Christ, during the millenium; will be in this world. See Mr. Taylor on the Apostacy Pt. i. App. No. II. p. 183.

xvii. 2. 9. 22. xxi. 7—11. John iii. 13. Acts ii. 11. iii. 20. 21. vii. 56. 2 Theff. i. 7. 10. Heb. ix. 28. 1 Pet. i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 16. Apoc. i. 7. 13.

The disciples of Jesus who are dead shall then revive.—1 Cor. xv. 23. 1 Theff. iv. 14. Apoc. vi. 11. xiv. 13*. xix. 9. xx. 4. 6.

The rest of the dead shall not then revive,—Apoc. xx. 5.

Those who are alive at the coming of the Lord Jesus, shall be changed. 1 Cor. xv. 51. Phil. iii. 21.

They, together with the reanimated persons, shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air.—1 Theff. vi. 17. 2 Theff. ii. 1.

On these persons death will have no further power.—Luke xx. 36. 1 Cor. xv. 54. 1 Theff. iv. 17. Apoc. xx. 6. xxi. 4.

They will be made like Christ.—Phil. iii. 21. Col. iii. 4. 1 John iii. 2.

They will reign with him in the millenary kingdom.—Dan. vii. 18. 22. Mat. xxv. 34. Luke xix. 17, 18, 19. xxii. 29. Rom. v. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 12. 1 Cor. vi. 2. 2 Pet. i. 11. Heb. xii. 28. Apoc. i. 6. 9. ii. 26. iii. 21. v. 10. vii. 9—14. xxii. 5.

* The import of this text seems to be, that from that period, after the punishment of the worshippers of the beast, and before the coming of the Son of man, commences the blessedness of those who have died in the Lord. *οι αποθνησκοντες*, a present participle, with the article prefixed, may be referred to any time, past, present, or future. See Taylor on Romans, ii. 1.

This

This is the great hope and reward held out to Christians.—Mat. v. 3. xxiv. 46. xxv. 34. Luke xii. 37. 43. 1 Cor. i. 7. v. 5. Eph. v. 5. Phil. i. 6. iii. 11. Col. iii. 4. 1 Theff. i. 10. ii. 19. iii. 13. v. 23. 2 Theff. i. 7. 1 Tim. vi. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Tit. ii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 7. v. 4. 2 Pet. i. 16. iii. 4. 12. 1 John ii. 28. iii. 2. Heb. ix. 28. James v. 7, 8. Apoc. xiv. 13. xvi. 15. xix. 9. xx. 6.

The new heavens and earth.—2 Pet. iii. 10. 12, 13. Apoc. xx. 11. xxi. 1.

Marriage of the Lamb.—Mat. xxii. 2.—14. xxv. 1—13. Luke xii. 36. Apoc. xix. 7. xxi. 9.

Restoration of a theocracy after the manner of the Jewish.—Mat. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30. Eph. v. 5. Heb. xii. 22. Apoc. vii. 4—8. xi. 15. xxi. 3. 10. 12. 23.

A great slaughter upon earth at the time of Christ's second coming.—Dan. xii. 1. Luke xix. 27. 1 Theff. v. 3. 2 Theff. i. 9. Apoc. xiv. 14. xvi. 16. xvii. 14. xix. 11—17—21.

The supporters of spiritual tyranny then destroyed.—Dan. vii. 11. 26. 2 Theff. ii. 8. Apoc. xiv. 8. xviii. 2—24. xx. 20.

The patron of idolatry bound for a thousand years.—Apoc. xx. 2.

After that, let loose for a short time.—Apoc. xx. 7.

Destroyed.—Mat. xxv. 41. Apoc. xx. 10.

The general resurrection and judgment.—Dan. xii. 2. 12, 13. Mat. xiii. 38—43. xvi. 27. xxv. 32. Luke xix. 12—27. John v. 28.

Acts

of Heaven will commence. 283

Acts xvii. 31. Rom. v. 17. 1 Cor. xv. 22.
2 Tim. iv. 1. 1 Pet. iv. 5. Jude 15.

Abolition of death.—1 Cor. xv. 26. 54.
Apoc. xx. 14. xxi. 4. xxii. 1, 2.

God all in all.—1 Cor. xv. 24. 28.

Paradise.—Luke xxiii. 43. Apoc. ii. 7. xxii.
2, 3. 14.

General Observation.

In the writings of the apostles and evangelists, prior to the apocalypse, little, if any thing, transpires, concerning the exact order of events to take place after the coming of Christ. Our Lord's reign is represented as commencing with the *general* judgment. Little is said on the subject of a two-fold resurrection; though Paul asserts that they who are Christ's shall rise first. In one passage only of this apostle do we find that our Lord should cease to reign, after the millenium shall be compleated. Of the infraction of Satan upon that state, and his consequent final destruction, no mention is made. Nor is any distinction intimated between the millenium (or marriage of the Lamb, or Theocracy) and Paradise, which will commence with the general resurrection. The new testament writers appear to have extended their ideas of the future happiness of the virtuous, no farther than to the kingdom of Christ: and our Lord himself in his answer to the penitent thief, appears to have regarded the paradisaical state, as no other than that of his kingdom; though it should seem from the Apocalypse, that the former will
be

be subsequent to the latter. 'Novam Jerusalem, descriptam, c. 21. excipit Paradisus.' Mede's Works, 431.

I D I O T A.

An Essay on the Grounds of Love to Christ.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

YOUR having given a place in your valuable Repository to the paper of X. Y. Z. *on the Love of Christ*, is not only a mark of respect and distinction bestowed on that piece, but seems to carry with it an approbation of the hint with which the author closes, and to express your disposition to receive a candid and pertinent illustration of the point which he wishes to see discussed.

"I should be very happy, says he, to see, in one connected view, all that is said in the New Testament respecting this duty (the Love of Christ) and the explanation of those texts on the supposition that Jesus Christ was a mere man, incapable, of and from himself, of acting as he did while on earth, if the divine spirit had not constantly animated, directed and assisted him."

The difficulty stated by X. Y. Z. appears to me, as it does to him, to be serious and important:

portant: and it is certainly of a popular nature, and will be a bar to the reception of strict Unitarian sentiments, particularly, with those who exercise their warmer affections more than their cool judgment in matters of religion. It calls therefore for a full discussion. But, besides this, it is a pleasure to read, it is a pleasure to consider and weigh the positions advanced by so candid and liberal a writer. May I be permitted therefore, through the channel of your miscellany, to submit the following remarks to his consideration,

I would begin with that mode of treating the question which he proposes in the conclusion of his piece. For this method is at once to come to the source, and fountain head, of all our obligations to the duty on which he has his difficulties. The real question with us should be, not *what motives* to the *love of Christ* doth any particular scheme of sentiments concerning his person supply; but, on what grounds do the *Scriptures* recommend and enforce it: and what doth the New Testament appear to mean by this affection? It is therefore very proper, and even a most direct way, of coming to some clear and authoritative conclusion, to bring into a connected view, as X. Y. Z. wishes to be done, *all the texts* that speak of this duty. The review of these texts will also suggest some remarks on what this writer hath offered on the subject.

On collecting them together, it is obvious, that the texts, in which mention is made of the *love of Christ*, divide themselves into two classes:

as

as the phrase may mean either *his* love to us, or *our* affection to him. It is proposed therefore to follow this arrangement as being both just and natural in itself; and as the passages, under the first, will throw light upon those which we shall bring forward under the second, class.

To begin with those passages which speak of the *love of Christ* to mankind. The first texts which offer here are the declarations of Christ concerning his love of his disciples and his exhortations to them to love one another, as John xiii. 34. with ch. xv. 9. 12, 13. "*A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friend.*" Here Christ only asserts in general terms, the affection which he bore to his disciples, and exhibits it as a ground and model of that which they should cultivate to one another. He characteriseth it as common to his Father, himself and his disciples; which was, as to its nature, the same in each. The affection itself, and not the particular grounds or effects of it, is the point here represented and enforced. In the last of these verses our Lord does indeed point at one great proof of his affection, that of *laying down his life for his friend*, in which way the Father's love to himself could not be expressed, but their's to one another might be shewn. This passage only proves that the same disposition may exist in different minds on different principles, and be exercised

exercised in different ways. Here is nothing that leads us to conceive of a prior existence in glory and dignity, as *essential* either to express Christ's love to mankind, or as the ground of our gratitude and love to him. Nay, it is remarkable, when Christ evidently intends here to refer to the *bighest proof* of his love, he speaks of it only as exerting itself in *the same way as one man can show his love to another*: He speaks of his own death, as the death of a *man*, not as the humiliation of a being more than human, or superangelical. As far as the language of Christ here is particular and precise, it doth not correspond to the Arian notion.

Nothing can be drawn particularly in favour of that sentiment from the descriptive manner in which the apostle speaks of the love of Christ, Rom. viii. 37. *We are more than conquerors through him that loved us*. In the preceding 35th verse the apostle speaks of the *love of Christ*, not as an *affection* which he had testified by any particular acts, but as a *blessing* in which we have a present interest and on which our hopes depend: *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* and it is explained, ver. 39. *by the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord*. Here the language of the sacred writer is general, and applieth not to any particular and specific instances of Christ's love.

The next text, to be alleged, is very clear and explicit. It not only speaks of the affection, but points to the chief instance, the greatest display of it. Gal. ii. 20. *The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God*

God who loved me and gave himself for me. To the same purpose is Eph. v. 2. 25. *Walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savour, ver. 25. Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it.* To the like effect is the last passage to be quoted under this head: *Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God: to him be glory for ever. Amen.*

It is observable that in these passages, where the love of Christ is set before us, as the object of our imitation and the ground of our praises to him; in these passages, where the writer explains it and dilates upon it, nothing is said of his having "undertaken to assume a body, " and to go through the various trying scenes " with which his life and death were attended," but the only instance of his love expressly mentioned is, that "*he gave himself for us;*" as if this act were the grand proof of his benevolence to us, the main and sufficient ground of our obligations to him. The principle, on which X. Y. Z. conceives Christ to be the object of our gratitude and love is not once mentioned: a perfect silence about it reigns through all these passages. This is quite consonant to many other places, in which the love of Christ is not, in so many words, mentioned; but in which his dying for us is spoken of with great emphasis; and in which the stress is laid upon this instance of self-denial and benevolence, as the greatest he could give. See Mat. xx. 28. John x. 11.

17. Gal. i. 4. Phil. ii. 8. 1 Tim. ii. 6.
Tit. ii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 19. ch. ii. 24. 1 John
iii. 16.

X. Y. Z. will, on reflexion, own that this was a singular act of love and friendship to mankind, and must perceive that the Unitarian sentiments preserve *that very ground* of love and gratitude to Jesus Christ, which the New Testament exhibits, and from which it derives its arguments and exhortations. In estimating this instance of Christ's affection to mankind, the circumstances and nature of his death should be taken into consideration; that he humbled himself unto the death of the cross, a most painful, and above all, a most ignominious death: that he suffered the just for the unjust to bring us to God. To these circumstances, viz. the innocence of his character, and the kind of death he underwent, the sacred writers particularly refer, as heightening his condescension and friendship. But X. Y. Z. will observe that the circumstance on which *he* lays the greatest stress, viz. a degradation from a glorious pre-existent state, though it should be supposed that it is implied in some representations of the character of Christ, yet is never even hinted at, when his death is spoken of: though so proper to cast a glory round it, as illustrating his grace and philanthropy. An Arian, it is evident from the feelings which X. Y. Z. expresses, would not have written in this strain, would not have omitted a consideration, on *his* scheme, so important and forcible. And it is inconceivable that the sacred writers, if they had entertained

VOL. VI.

U

similar

similar ideas, would have written as they *have done*.

These remarks offer a solution of the difficulty which X. Y. Z. intimates, when he says: "Nor do I see why, on Unitarian principles" "Jesus Christ is the object of a Christian's" "gratitude and love any more than, under the" "Jewish dispensation, Moses was the object" "of these affections to the Jews." From what has been advanced it is plain, there was a marked difference between the two characters. Moses did not *die* for his country. He practised indeed a noble self-denial for their sake: but he did not sacrifice his life in their cause. Nor, as I recollect, is he ever once held up to the Israelites as the object of their love. He was the virtuous, disinterested *lawgiver*; a character deserving great respect: Christ was the *suffering, dying, friend*; a character which insinuates itself into the heart, and constrains affection.

There is another material point of difference in the two cases. Moses promised an inheritance to the Israelites, but did not himself come to a share in the possession: and his personal connexion with them ceased at his death. Between Christ and his disciples there subsists a *common interest*, as well as one common nature; a joint participation in the same titles, privileges and inheritance: they are *his brethren*; after his resurrection he avowed the relation; on the great day he will avow it. *His God is our God: his Father is our Father*: we are the sons of God as well as he was: we are *joint-heirs* with him: he is indeed unseen: he is removed from us. But as he

he died, so he arose again for us: he entered into heaven as our forerunner: he will come again to our salvation, and to take us into a share of his throne and glory. We have still much to hope from him; nay, the noblest blessings to receive from him. These are *endearments*, these are bonds of affection, which did not subsist between Moses and the Israelites: and which, be it added, are in a manner undermined by the Arian scheme. For *this* represents Christ, not properly as our *elder brother*, but as a glorious being, originally, to an inconceivable degree, *above us*; and who must be considered, even notwithstanding his humiliation, as retaining his natural high prerogatives. On *that scheme* we may look up to him with reverence and gratitude; but astonishment and awe must mingle with our affection, and must take much from the softness, pleasure and endearment of it. The love of him, as *our brother*, cannot be felt: the gentle, winning attractions of his humiliation are overpowered by the glories of his first dignity: the thought of what was *human*, though the New Testament frequently holds up *that* to our consideration, and lays great stress upon it, is lost in the contemplation of what was *superangelical*. The former is scarcely compatible, certainly does not easily and naturally harmonise, with the latter.

We next proceed to review the texts which speak of *our love of Christ*. The first under this class is Mat. x. 37. *He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not*

U 2.

worthy

worthy of me: *i. e.* as the words are paraphrased by Dr. Clark, “when things come to this extremity, that a man must either lose the friendship of the dearest relations or forsake his religion; all earthly and temporal considerations must yield to the one thing necessary, of securing an eternal interest. For whosoever shall prefer the love of a father or mother, or brother or sister before true religion and virtue; cannot be a sincere disciple of Christ, or be accounted worthy to be admitted into the kingdom.” Or, as Dr. Doddridge glosses on the words, “*he who loveth father or mother more than me*, and is induced by his regard to them to disobey my precepts or renounce my doctrine is not worthy of me.” The justness of this explanation of the love of Christ is established by the language used in the context, where our Lord enforces the confessing him before men, and warns against denying him before men; but especially by the characteristics of a true disciple, which he lays down ver. 38. viz. “taking up his cross and following after him.” Such a love of Christ, it must be allowed, is not peculiar, or appropriate to any speculative ideas formed concerning his original dignity; but common to and practicable upon all schemes.

In some other places the *love of Christ* is by our divine master himself represented as consisting in obedience to him, or as deriving from obedience its essential nature. *If ye love me, keep my commandments. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; if any man love me, he will keep my words; he*

he that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings.

John xiv. 13. 21. 23, 24. Now what is in other places represented as the ground of this obedience; no other than this, the *authority* with which Christ acted. Thus Peter; *Moses truly said, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatever he shall say unto you.*

Thus the voice from heaven declared: "*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; bear ye him.*" Mat. xvii. 5.

In the 28th verse, it is true, the *love of Christ* is represented as an affection which will give those who possess it a sensible interest in what relates to the dignity and happiness of their master. But then the ground or incentive to this generous sympathy, which Christ expresseth an expectation of meeting with in his disciples, is not any prior glory, but his future exaltation.

He refers this influence of their love, not back to any past period of his being for its cause, but, forward to a future event. "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said I go unto my Father; for my Father is greater than I."

These remarks may be applied to ascertain the full force of that passage, which X. Y. Z. considers as deserving of particular notice. 1 Cor. xvi. 22. *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.* X. Y. Z. it may be presumed, judges that the awful denunciation, with which the *love of Christ* is here enforced, implieth that there is a peculiar criminality, an aggravated sin, in not loving the Lord

Jesus Christ. This is to be granted. But doth it therefore follow, that the guilt of it is to be estimated only, or principally, by the idea of a pre-existent glory, which he laid aside for our sakes; and which condescension was a peculiar claim to our gratitude? The apostle doth not assert; he doth not even insinuate, this. For, while the nature of a Christian's love to his Master is well ascertained by the former passages to consist in obedience to his precepts, and in an attachment to his cause, the *ground* of this duty, it is intimated by the apostle, is not any character supported by Christ before the world was, but the character he sustained after his appearance on earth, especially after his resurrection, when he was made Lord and Christ*. For this is the obligation, at which the apostle points by the language, which he uses concerning his master: *our Lord Jesus Christ, i. e. him*, who is sat down at the right hand of God: *him*, who is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour. X. Y. Z. perhaps, may deem power and authority to be improperly considered as a ground of *love*. And this must be allowed, if by *love* we mean only the animal passion; but if, as it appears from the preceding passages to be the case, we understand by it the rational affection, or rather an

* Hunc titulum addit, ut causam insinuet ob quam Jesum Christum diligere debeamus, & nisi id faciamus merito sumus anathemate feriendi. Quis enim non debeat amare suum dominum a dextris Dei sedentem, suum Redemptorem et servatorem? Quis si hoc non faciat, non mereatur ut anathema sit? et si eum etiam dominum suum esse abneget, ut anathema sit maranatha? Vide Slichtingium in loc.

attachement

attachment to the doctrine and obedience to the precepts of Christ, authority is the proper ground of it: from hence doth the obligation to it arise; especially when it is power lodged in the hands of a benevolent person, and authority invested in the friend and saviour.

One text, which may be considered as very important in this discussion, is Ephesians iii. 14. 17, 18, 19. *For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that you being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length, and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.* Here the language of the apostle is so full and energetic, that some may suppose the idea of Christ's voluntary degradation from a former state of glory must be admitted, to justify the force and strength of it. But a more careful inspection of the passage will shew this to be a mere supposition. Now, not to say that the *love of Christ* cannot necessarily be understood to mean other, than the love of God by Christ*; the love of which he is the revealer and instrument, it is plain, that though the apostle meant the benevolence exercised by Christ himself, yet he did not refer to the labour and condescension, at the expence of which Christ hath served our eternal interest; but to

* *Charitas Christi*, id est, qua a Deo per Christum diligimur, quæ Dei quidem est, sed quia a Christo nobis revelata et oblata est, ideo charitas vel gratia Christi dicitur, ad Rom. i. 15. and vii. 39. confer cum, 39. Vide Crellium in loc.

the *benefits* of redemption: to the *blessings* secured and imparted, and not to the humiliation and sufferings by which they were secured. It appears from the context, ver. 1—12. that the apostle's mind laboured with the subject which offered to his thoughts. What was this subject? Not the condescension of Christ; but the mystery, which from the beginning of the world had been hid with God, the *preaching to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.*" On this account it was, that he bowed his knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they *might know the love of Christ*; or the vast extent of the christian scheme of grace; its unlimited influence, and comprehensive reach.

Another passage to which, in this enquiry, we must advert is Ephes. vi. 24. *Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Or with incorruption,* as it is in the margin of our bibles. Mr. Locke's note, on this text, as just and precise, deserves attention. "In this
 " epistle to the Ephesians, Paul sets forth the
 " gospel as a dispensation so much, in every
 " thing superior to the law, that it was to
 " debase, corrupt and destroy the gospel, to join
 " circumcision and the observances of the law
 " as necessary to it. Having written this epistle
 " to this end, he here, in the close, having the
 " same thought still upon his mind, pronounces
 " *favour on all those who love the Lord Jesus*
 " *Christ in incorruption,* i. e. without mixing or
 " joining any thing with him in the work of our
 " salvation, that may render the gospel useless
 " and ineffectual."

The

The only text, which remains to be produced under this head is 1 Pet. i. 8. *Whom having not seen ye love.* The only idea, on the subject, peculiar to this clause, is that of the circumstance which set off to advantage the affection which the Christians, whom Peter addressed, felt towards their divine master: namely, that it was not aided and invigorated by a personal acquaintance with its object. But this passage suggests nothing particular concerning the nature and obligations of our love to Christ. And though in the context there is an express and animated representation of benefits derived to us through Jesus Christ, or to be communicated at his appearance, yet there is no reference to the principle which X. Y. Z. conceives to lie at the foundation of love to Christ. The apostle insists upon the *resurrection* of Christ, and on his *appearance again*, but as to his *coming into this world*, from a prior and more exalted state of being, he is silent about it.

Thus we have placed together, in one connected view, all that is said in the New Testament concerning this duty, the love of Christ, except one passage: in which there is an ambiguity; but an ambiguity that doth not affect this argument, but only makes it uncertain to which class of texts, in our arrangement, it belongs; whether to those that speak of the affection of Christ towards us, or of ours towards him. It is in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. *The love of Christ constraineth us: because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they who live should not henceforth*

forth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again. But which ever way the language of the apostle in the first clause, is explained, the following clauses amply state the ground, on which the sentiments of love and gratitude to Christ were felt and cultivated: *This is no other, than his dying for us.*

On the survey of the whole, it is remarkable, that the love of Christ is, in *every* passage, represented and enforced without any regard to, and *totally independent* of, the consideration of his having left a former state, and relinquished any prior glory. I should conceive therefore, that if strict Unitarian principles have any "tendency" to abate the love and reverence which have hitherto appeared to X. Y. Z. to be due to "Jesus Christ," it must proceed not from these principles themselves, but from the association, that has long existed in his mind, being dissolved by embracing those principles. The texts we have enumerated, exhort and persuade to the love of Christ on principles very *distinct* and *remote* from the idea of his pre-existence, in circumstances of great power and glory. These principles are therefore to be deemed the just, sufficient, and indeed only *scriptural* grounds of that affection. If they do not beget and cherish lively sentiments of love and gratitude to Jesus Christ, the defect must be, not in the principles, but in *the mind*; which, having but lately received them, doth not yet feel the full force of them.

It often strikes me, that Arian christians are so accustomed to consider the character and condescension

descent of Christ, in connexion with their idea of his former dignity; they are so habituated to ascribe in a manner, all the merit and excellence of his benevolence to his quitting that dignity, that they seem to overlook the condescensions and humility of his deportment, "the benevolent" part which he acted on earth," and his dying for us; on which last great instance of his friendship, as we have seen, the scriptures lay the stress; and the consideration of which they exhibit, *detached by itself*, without representing it as deriving its merit from a contrast with his former glory. Upon the Arian scheme it should seem, Christ cannot be supposed to look upon death *with the sentiments and feelings of a man*. He must have been a stranger to the *natural love of life*; to that strong attachment to the present state of being, of which we are conscious: for the continuance of life would present to him nothing worthy the desire of so *exalted* a being. To die, in *his* case was, on *that* scheme, to resume his dignity; to be delivered from the body, which he had assumed. Under these circumstances, what self-denial, what sacrifice could it be in *Him*, to give up his life?

Should it be urged, that to represent the benevolence as principally consisting in his submission to the death of the cross, without taking in the consideration of his prior glory, is to reduce his benevolence to a level with that of many other men, who have willingly met death in its worst forms, for the sake of truth and human happiness; it may, in reply, be asked, when this argument is brought forward, is not what

was peculiar to the case of Christ, forgotten? Is it not forgotten; that, as he himself said, when he was apprehended, he could have "prayed to his Father, and thereupon he would have sent legions of angels to rescue him:" That "no man took his life from him, but that he laid it down of himself?" These expressions denote that Christ was not a mere *passive instrument*: but that he acted in his great character with a benevolent *design*, and preferred the accomplishing the kind purposes of it, in the fullest extent, to the preservation of his life; though he could have preserved it with honour and piety; though he could have procured a super-natural, consequently a glorious, interposition in his favour.

The remark of X. Y. Z. with respect to the use Christ made of his miraculous powers, viz. "That it cannot be on any ground supposed, that the same divine energy would have attended Christ on the supposition of its having been possible for him to have attempted the application of it to any purpose, directly opposite to those for which it was bestowed:" and his more general observation, "I cannot suppose, that our Saviour had it in his power to have defeated the purposes of infinite wisdom, by which he was continually directed." These remarks, I apprehend, may be retorted and applied with equal force to the Arian sentiment. On that scheme, he was in actual possession of glory and power, more than human or angelic, before the world was: which the counsels of divine benevolence required him, for a time,

time, to relinquish and lay aside. Had he it in his power to counteract those purposes, by declining to assume a body, and to go through the various trying scenes with which his life and death would be attended? Or if he were a voluntary agent in relinquishing this dignity, why ought he not to be considered as *equally so in declining* to avail himself of his miraculous powers to answer any purposes of ambition; and in giving up his life for mankind?

For though he did, not by *his own* power, perform the works, but his *Father* who was with him, did them: yet the consciousness of such an energy attending him, the consciousness that God "heard him always" was to one, who was in all points tempted like as we are, a strong temptation to pride and ambition. The effects, the glorious displays, of this energy gave him an amazing *influence*, which was in itself a powerful temptation to swerve from the great ends of his mission. But he was superior to these snares: and, in this view, have not his self-denial, humility, and death, singular merit*? In a word, on the Arian or Unitarian scheme, Christ was as really a voluntary agent in the execution of the divine purposes, as are any of us in the common spheres of life. The merit and glory of an agent, acting from motives of benevolence, freely embarking in a great and noble design, and, in the prosecution of it, meeting with reproach, poverty, sufferings, and death, are justly to be given to

* See these thoughts pursued and illustrated with great force, by the excellent *Dr. Price* in his sermons, p. 357—360.

him :

Him: and bring us under the obligations of love and gratitude.

These remarks are submitted to X. Y. Z. and it is referred to him, whether the love of Christ doth not stand in the scriptures, *wholly independent* of the idea of his pre-existent glory. *That idea* may be allowed to supply a motive, a ground for the duty: but the duty ariseth from other considerations; and wherever it is mentioned, is not inculcated by *that* argument.

PHILOSOTER.

(D^r. Toulmin)

Observations on Christ's Agony in the Garden.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING, in a former communication, endeavoured to shew that our Saviour, on the supposition of his being *a mere man*, could not, naturally, know more than other men; that without divine assistance, he must necessarily have been as fallible, and even as peccable, as other men, and that much advantage arises to the cause of christianity from considering him in this light; I shall now endeavour to explain, upon these principles, his feelings on the most interesting scene in his whole history, viz. the agony in the

the garden. To me they are inexplicable on any other hypothesis.

The Bishop of Clogher, who held the Arian doctrine, viz. that Christ was a great super-angelic spirit united to a human body, and knew himself to be such, says, as is he quoted by Dr. Lardner, in the second postscript to his letter on the Logos, p. 203. that "the view of his sufferings in the flesh could never have moved him in so high a degree, being only such sufferings as the prophets of old underwent, not only without dread, but with pleasure in their countenances. Whoever, therefore, can suppose Jesus to have been terrified at these things, which could only affect his human part, must suppose him to be less than a man; whereas, if we suppose Satan let loose upon him, by the permission of God, and impowered to attack him in his nobler part, in his angelic nature, while his divine spirit, being encumbered with a load of flesh and blood, fettered and confined within the compass of a human tabernacle, was disabled from exerting its full powers, well might he dread the conflict on such unequal terms." Again he speaks of Christ's external sufferings, as "in their own nature, as so insignificant and trifling, that they could not possibly be any trial of his obedience."

I do not wonder that Arians should be led to such a strange hypothesis as this to account for our Saviour's agony. An attentive consideration of it, must I think, much embarrass even those who maintain that, as *a man*, Jesus was the most perfect of his species, intirely free from the defects
and

and imperfections incident to all other men, such as some suppose Adam to have been before his fall. For if so, having greater strength of mind than other men, he must have been capable of viewing approaching evils with more intrepidity than other men; whereas, without having recourse to the hypothesis of the Bishop of Clogher, or that of those who say that God himself, by his own immediate agency, made Christ to suffer in a manner inconceivable by us, for the sins of all the elect, he appears to have been possessed of less strength of mind than many other men, suffering under the apprehension of pain and death more than many of his followers.

All that we know concerning our Saviour's agony may, I think, be accounted for on the common principles of human nature, and may be sufficiently explained by considering what men in general are known to feel in similar situations; especially if we take into the account, that men's feelings are more or less exquisite in proportion to their natural sensibility of mind, and the distinctness of their ideas of what they have to suffer.

It is a well known observation that, in general, persons suffer more from the apprehension of evil, than from the evils themselves; and they who have attended to their feelings in both situations, are unanimous in their testimony, that bodily pain, even in the extreme, is far less dreadful than certain *states of mind* unaccompanied with any proper bodily pain at all. And this dreadful state of mind is often brought on by the long continued expectation of evils of no great magnitude.

The

The first information that any person has of approaching pain (that for instance, of the amputation of a limb, or the operation of cutting for the stone) necessarily gives an uneasy sensation. But the next time that he thinks of it, the painful scene is not only nearer, and will on that account affect his mind more sensibly, but the sensation will be heightened by the remains of his former feelings, which will be revived by this means. It is like repeating a stroke on a place already sore from a former blow. In this manner, if nothing should intervene to make him look upon the evil in a less formidable light, the materials, as we may say, for painful emotion, will accumulate even without limits; insomuch that there are instances (cases of great sensibility no doubt) of persons actually dying of mere apprehension; and great numbers have been found in a state very near to death, when they have been brought to a public execution.

If, during the expectation of any evil, we have an opportunity of seeing others suffer the same, and they seem to feel acutely under it, our painful sensations on the idea of our own suffering are greatly encreased; our idea of it being then more distinct, and therefore capable of exciting the corresponding sensations more perfectly, so as greatly to add to their intenseness. This is more sensibly the effect of our own actual experience of any evil. In this case, even though we should make no great account of the pain or suffering the first time that we feel it, and we have no reason to think that it will be greater the second time than the first, yet the *dread* of it is always found to be the stronger every time. Some

persons will even faint away, and be thrown into the greatest terror and agitation, after having undergone an operation not more painful than that of drawing a tooth, before they can be persuaded to undergo the same operation again. At the same time that they cannot but acknowledge, that the pain itself is momentary, and not worth regarding, yet their agony of mind under the apprehension of it shall be inexpressible, affecting the whole nervous system in the most violent manner.

Can we then wonder, when we are every day witnesses to such prodigious terror of mind on the apprehension of some very inconsiderable pains, that our Saviour should be affected as he was with the idea of his approaching sufferings; when those sufferings had in them every thing that can excite our horror. We must forget that he was *a man*, if we think that there was any thing extraordinary in it. He knew that he was to be publicly insulted, cruelly beaten, nailed alive to a cross, and there exposed, naked, to public view, till he expired, in company with wretches who justly deserved that painful and ignominious death.

His feelings would be greatly aggravated by the distinct knowledge which he appears to have had of all the circumstances of his death, for more than a year before the dreadful moment came; and in that time, it is very possible, that he might have seen many executions of the same kind, which would, no doubt, draw his very particular attention; as they naturally would that of any other man who should have known that
he

he was to suffer the same himself. Every thought of it would be attended with a pang, and every second pang would be increased by the addition of what would remain of the former.

In this situation, if it had not been for the consciousness which our Lord had of the presence of God with him, and a perfect knowledge of the state of exaltation and glory to which his sufferings would introduce him, the prospect might have been insupportable. There are many men who, in the same state of apprehension, could not have been kept alive to the end of the year. Their appetites would have failed them, they would have been incapable of any enjoyment, or of that degree of exhilaration, without which the vital functions could not be kept up; and diseases peculiar to that state of body would have carried them off prematurely. How many are there who actually die of what is called a *broken heart*, in less time than a year, and some who have been young and vigorous. With so much certainty do sensations of the mind affect the body.

We cannot doubt, but that our Lord had many agonizing thoughts, from the idea of his approaching sufferings, in the course of his public ministry, though only one great scene of this kind is particularly recorded.

It appears, however, that, previous to this, he was apt to view his approaching sufferings with very painful apprehension. This is evident from what he said respecting the evils that his religion would be the occasion of. Luke xii. 49. 50. *I am come to send fire on the earth, &c.*

X 2

But

But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened (συνεχμαινόμενος) till it be accomplished. The evangelist John, also, mentions another occasion, on which he had feelings of the same kind, a few days before his death. He was then in the temple; and speaking of his approaching death, he described it under the image of sowing a seed, and leaving it to die in the ground, with a view to its reproduction and increase. John xii. 27. *Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say, Father save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour.* This is expressive of what he afterwards felt in the garden, though it was of less continuance.

Luke says (xxii. 44.) that during our Lord's agony, *he sweated as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.* Now there have been cases in which persons of a delicate constitution, and great sensibility, have not only been thrown into a sweat with fear and terror, but have had their sweat even tinged with blood. Sweat, like every other animal fluid, is secreted from the blood; and whenever any secretion is very copious, and the glands much relaxed, some globules of blood will pass unaltered. There are accounts of blood being mixed with profuse tears, as well as with profuse sweat. In this respect, therefore, the historian has related nothing that is unnatural, though his meaning may have been, not that the sweat consisted of blood, but that it was in large drops, like those of blood. Indeed, instances of such extreme bodily affection from mental causes are so rare, that a person who drew his picture from

from imagination only, and not from a known fact, would never have thought of introducing such a circumstance.

That our Lord had great sensibility of mind, which usually accompanies delicacy of constitution, we see by his strong emotions, especially of the tender and compassionate kind, on several occasions. When he came in view of Jerusalem, the last time that he was to visit it, he not only lamented, but *wept* over it. Luke xix. 41. and yet his own sufferings were nearer than the destruction of Jerusalem. A prospect of the same calamities must have made a deep impression upon his mind, when, even as he was going to execution, his mind was not so much occupied with the idea of that dreadful scene, but that he could tell the women who were weeping and bewailing his condition, not to weep for him, but for themselves, and their children, on account of the evils that were coming upon them. Luke xxiii. 28.

It is a mark of the same tender sensibility of mind, that when Jesus was going to raise Lazarus from the dead, he joined the mourning relations and friends in *weeping* along with them. Mention is several times made of his *having compassion* upon the multitudes, who crowded after him, and on particular persons who applied to him for cures. All these circumstances, as well as the strong affection which he entertained for his disciples, and the concern which he expressed for them when he was going to leave them, are symptoms of an exquisitely feeling mind.

With a mind so susceptible of strong impressions, and so apt to look forwards to distant events, as that of our Saviour's seems to have been, it is the less extraordinary that he should frequently think of his cruel sufferings and death, and that the prospect of them should make a deep impression upon him. But all this might be necessary for the discipline of his own mind, and to prevent that too great elation, which might have been the unavoidable consequence of the view of his future glory, if it had not been preceded by a scene of so much pain and affliction. *He was made perfect through suffering,* as other men are. This prospect would keep his mind in its right poise, and preserve in it that sense of deep humility, and resignation to the will of God, which, in the natural course of things, perhaps, nothing else could have done. To feel as our Saviour did, nothing was requisite but a mind like that of other men, in the same extraordinary circumstances. His dignity and elevation of mind, no doubt, exceeded that of any other man. But then the situation, and the prospects, which produced that elevation of mind were peculiarly to himself.

It may be added that perhaps the contrast between the view of future glory on the one hand, and that of extreme suffering on the other, with both of which our Lord's mind was strongly impressed, might have some share in exciting that uncommon agitation of mind, which constituted his agony in the garden. Joy and grief
in

in some cases produce the same effects, and both together may produce still greater.

Notwithstanding a great general similarity in the constitutions of all men, we find considerable varieties in them; and differences in *genius*, or mental powers, are not more conspicuous than differences in what we call *temper* and *strength of mind*. And though the pain itself, when the flesh is mangled, and the bones broken, &c. may be nearly the same in all, yet one man shall entertain a much less dread of it than another, and likewise bear it with much more fortitude. This indifference to the idea of pain may arise from two opposite causes. The first is a *want of reflection*, in consequence of which a person shall not be apt to look either to the *past*, or the *future*, being wholly occupied with the *present*. In this case it must require frequent experience of pain to fill the mind with much dread of it.

The fear of pain may also be very little in a mind given to *much reflection*, and of great *comprehension*, in which ideas of things past, present, and to come, shall be so united, and mixed, as to give a man the enjoyment of all his sensations within a considerable space; so that pleasurable feelings will not fail to mix with, and if they be superior in degree or duration, to overpower, the painful ones. In this state of mind the dread of any evil, though ever so near, will be wholly lost in the prospect of the greater good that is to result from it. This is the most perfect state of man, and that to which long experience will necessarily bring us; it being the unavoidable consequence of the association

of ideas and sensations, which is the great law of our natures.

To this our Saviour evidently had not attained. *For the joy that was set before him he did, indeed, endure the cross, but not without the most agonizing feelings on the near approach of it.* It is evident, however, that his mind was of a deeply reflective turn, and consequently apprehensive of future evils. But for want of more time, and experience, he was far from having arrived at a state of perfect comprehension of mind, in which the idea of approaching evil is extinguished in the prospect of the following good. They were not only perceived as things of a very different nature, but as having less connexion with each other than they really had. This, however, is far from being an argument of a less perfect constitution of mind.

On the contrary, it may rather indicate the most perfect possible, discovering a great disposition to *reflection*, that is, to look beyond the present moment, to conceive of future situations as actually present, so that nothing but *time* might be requisite to make the ideas of distant connected events perfectly to coalesce. It should likewise be added, that the view of his future glory was more general, and less distinct, than that of his intermediate sufferings.

To me the acuteness of our Saviour's sensations on the view of his approaching death is a proof, not only of his being, in all respects, *a man*, having a constitution of mind as well as of body, exactly like that of other men; but also of his not having had any pre-existent state.

Had.

Had his being commenced before the creation of the world, though his powers had not exceeded those of other men, and had he had any sphere of action from that time to the æra of his incarnation, he could not but have acquired more comprehension of mind than he appears to have been possessed of at the time of his death.

But perhaps no constitution, or state, of a human mind could have been better calculated to afford an example of submitting to pain and death more proper *for the use of mankind in general*, than that of Jesus was; because it was better adapted to shew the power of *faith*, and of *principle*, than any other, in overpowering a state of the most exquisite apprehension, without the aid of either natural insensibility on the one hand, or that of peculiar strength of mind, acquired by experience, on the other. Had he been in that state of perfection to which he, and perhaps we ourselves, shall hereafter arrive, he would by no means have been a proper example for *us*, because we are not yet arrived at that state. But feeling perhaps more than any of his followers ever would feel, and yet patiently submitting to it, because it was *the will of God*, and the way to future glory, we have no excuse for not following him. His faith, if it had greater supports, had likewise greater difficulties to surmount than ours; feeling perhaps more reluctance to suffer than any other man ever did.

Had our Lord shewn an insensibility to the fear of death, had he rather exulted than desponded on the near approach of it, it might have

have been said, that he had supports and advantages, natural or supernatural, that we have not. But the fact shews that he was destitute of them to a degree beyond most men, as he actually suffered more from the idea of pain and death than most other men do. Notwithstanding this, his obedience to God, and faith in his promises, were able to carry him through the dreaded scene.

When Christ is compared to men who are said to have slept sound before a painful death, and to have discovered no sensibility in any period of it, the nature and use of his *example* is not considered; his natural weakness, if it may be so called, being better calculated to shew the strength of his *faith*, and therefore affording more encouragement to us to follow his steps.

But certainly our encouragement to follow Christ in suffering and dying is greatly lessened by the notion of his having had a power over his own sensations, so that in any situation he could feel more or less at pleasure, and even put an end to all sensation by a premature death, which is strictly prohibited to all his followers, and justly esteemed unbecoming the firmness that is expected of other men. Christians who entertain this idea of their Saviour cannot have reflected on the nature of the case.

It may be said that, if Christ only felt as a *man* during his agony, we should find something similar to it in the accounts of some of the martyrs. But the probability is, that no history of any martyr was ever written with such perfect fidelity as that of Christ by the evangelists. It has

has been too much the object of the writers, and from the best views, viz. the encouragement of others, to exhibit the fortitude and heroism of the sufferers in the strongest light.

It must also be considered, that what a person suffers in his own mind, in the expectation of pain and death, is generally known only to himself; and that the affections of the bodily frame are seldom so great when he is in company, as to be visible to others. What our Saviour himself felt would not have been known, if he had not, for the best reasons, chosen that some of his disciples should be witnesses of it. For any thing that appears, his agony might not last half an hour, and presently after it he was perfectly composed; and his behaviour the day following was such as could have given no person the least suspicion of what he had felt the preceding night.

But though nothing is related of any particular martyr that approaches to the case of our Saviour, yet, besides what we may judge from our own experience in the expectation of less evils, of what *must* have sometimes been felt in the expectation of greater ones, some circumstances are occasionally mentioned by martyrologists, which sufficiently illustrate the account of the evangelists. There are numberless cases in which martyrs are represented as peculiarly intrepid during their trial, and also immediately before, and even during the time of extreme torture, compared with what they had felt on the more distant view of it, though the manner in which they were affected by that more distant view is not distinctly noted.

Many

Many letters are preserved of martyrs, written in the interval between their apprehension and their deaths. But, besides that historians would seldom chuse to publish any letters except such as, in their opinion, would do them credit, and serve the cause for which they suffered, that is shew their fortitude, a man who is capable of writing must be tolerably composed, and would not in general be himself inclined to dwell upon circumstances which would give himself and his friends pain.

From the account of one of the English martyrs, however, viz. Richard Woodman, it may easily be collected, that his sufferings during his conflict with himself, when as he says (Fox's Book of Martyrs, vol. iii. p. 673) while he was "loth to forego his wife and children" and goods, were extreme, "This battle," he says, "lasted not a quarter of an hour; but "it was sharper than death itself for the time, "I dare say." After this he appears to have been perfectly calm, and he suffered with great fortitude.

Having now, I presume, some idea of the extreme distress and agony of mind under which our Lord laboured, greater perhaps than any other man had ever felt before him, and also of the *causes* which produced it, let us consider his strength of mind in supporting the prospect of them. That he should wish to avoid going through the dreadful scene, we cannot think extraordinary. He would not have been a *man* if he had not, and that this wish should be expressed in the form of a prayer to that great Being

Being at whose sovereign disposal he and all mankind always are, was quite natural. In a truly devout mind, which respects the hand of God in every thing, an earnest *wish* and a *prayer*, are the same thing. Our Saviour, in this agony, did pray that *if it was possible, the bitter cup might pass from him*. But by *possible* must, no doubt, be meant *consistently with the designs of divine government*. He therefore only expressed his desire that his painful death and sufferings might be dispensed with, if the same great and good ends could have been attained without them. For there can be no doubt but that *with God all things are naturally possible*. Our Lord's wish, or prayer, was therefore only *conditional*, and not *absolute*. He did not wish to be excused from suffering, whatever might be the consequence. Even in this most painful state of apprehension, he did not look to himself only, but to God, and the great ends of his government.

We may think it extraordinary that our Lord should for a moment suppose that what he wished, or prayed for, was, in any sense of the word, *possible*, knowing, as he himself observes, that *for that end he came unto that hour*; his dying, with a view to a future resurrection being a necessary part of that plan which he was to be the principal instrument in executing. But, besides that, in a highly agitated state of mind, the thing might for a moment appear in a different light; our Lord well knew that the appointments of God, even when expressed in the most absolute terms, are not always so intended. We have more instances than one of similar orders

orders and appointments, by which nothing was meant but the trial of a person's faith.

This was the case when Abraham was ordered to offer up his beloved son Isaac. Till the moment that his hand was actually raised to slay his son, that patriarch had no reason whatever to think that the death of his son, and that by his own hand, was not intended by the divine Being. The order for the destruction of Ninevah in forty days was also delivered in absolute terms, though it was intended to be conditional, and in the event did not take place. Notwithstanding, therefore, all that had past in the communications which Jesus had with God, he could not tell, but that *possibly*, his death might not be necessary, and that the same end might be gained without it. In these circumstances, considering the natural love of life, and the dread of pain and death, the merest possibility, or the supposition of a possibility, would certainly justify our Lord's prayer, especially when it is considered that, in the same breath with which he uttered it, he added *nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt*. Notwithstanding the dread and horror of mind with which he viewed his approaching sufferings, he had no objection to them, if it was the determined will of God that he should bear them. This was a degree of resignation and fortitude which far exceeds any thing that we read of in history. In all other instances in which persons have sweated through the fear of death, they would have given, or have done, any thing to have avoided it. To them it appeared the greatest of all evils.

The

The courage which any man may shew while his nerves are firm is not to be compared with that of our Saviour's when his were, in a manner, broken, and subdued. It was not only while he was calm, and had a perfect command of himself; but when his perturbation and distress of mind was so great as to throw him into a profuse sweat, that he said, *not as I will but as thou wilt*. No man in any cool moment can form to himself an adequate idea of the heroism of this act. Because no man, in a cool moment, and under no terror of mind himself, can tell what his own wishes and prayers would be in a state of such dreadful agony as that of our Saviour. It will therefore be greater than he can conceive it to be. It is probable that nothing but the consciousness of his peculiarly near relation to God, and his full assurance of such a state of future glory as no other man would ever arrive at, could have supported him, and have preserved his resignation and fortitude, in a state of mind so peculiarly unfavourable to them.

Luke says that *an angel was sent to comfort him*, perhaps to suggest to him such considerations as, in his state of mind, he would be apt to overlook. But, in the language of scripture, any thing is called an *angel* by which God acts, though it be a natural cause. And it is observable that extreme perturbation of mind, from whatever cause it may arise, cannot continue always. With, or without, particular consolation, the mind never fails to recover its calm in some degree, and thus while things continue in the same state, extreme agitation of mind is followed

followed by the most perfect composure, and self-command. This indeed has generally been the case with persons who have had painful operations to suffer, or who have been condemned to public executions. And in general the more persons have suffered in mind before the dreaded moment, the greater fortitude they have shown in it.

This was remarkably the case with our Saviour. Notwithstanding his agony of mind, the preceding night, which, no doubt, must have greatly exhausted and weakened him, he went through his two trials with all the dreadful preliminaries of his execution, and the execution itself, with the most perfect composure. It is even probable that at the very time that they were nailing him to the cross, when, with respect to bodily pain, he would feel more than at any other moment, he prayed for his executioners, saying, *Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.*

In this, as well as in every circumstance of the gospel history, it is very observable that there is a much more accurate description of human nature, as we now find it to be, than it is at all probable that such men as the evangelists were could have drawn, except from real life. On the supposition of such an exalted human character as that of Jesus was (and such a character they could never have drawn from imagination) every thing that they relate of him is perfectly natural. He felt as other great and good men would feel, and he acted as other great and good men would act, in the same circumstances.

Every thing is uniformly great and consistent; and this is a strong internal proof of the truth of the history. It would have been the greatest of all miracles for such men as the evangelists were, to have written as they have done, from *imagination* alone. And if they had been capable of it, as their books were published in their own life time, such a fiction could never have been imposed upon the world for a true story. How happy is it that, in whatever view we consider the gospel history, we see ground for the fullest assurance of our faith in it. Christianity is *built upon a rock, and the gates of death shall not prevail against it.*

Let our consideration of this important part of the gospel history teach us that, as Christ suffered, and then entered into his glory, and as *he was made perfect by his sufferings*, we are not to expect an exemption from suffering. It was a solemn prayer of the apostle Peter (1 Pet. v. 10.) That *the God of all grace, who has called us to his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after we have suffered awhile, may make us perfect, establish, strengthen, and settle us.* But he had no idea that this great end could be accomplished without suffering. This world is a state of trial and probation. It was so to our Saviour, and it must be the same to all his followers. Happy are they who bear their sufferings as he bore his; not being insensible of their weight and pressure, but bearing them with patience and resignation, without complaining of those dispensations of providence, the object of which is our own

Vol. VI. X greatest

322 *Objections to Ordination.*

greatest good, but calmly and chearfully saying,
The will of the Lord be done.

*For the joy that was set before him, our Lord
indured the cross, despising the shame; and with
the same glorious hope set before us, we may
also rejoice in tribulation; knowing that all the
sufferings of the present life, be they ever so great,
will be infinitely overbalanced by that eternal
weight of glory for which they are the means of
preparing us.*

I am, Gentlemen,

Your humble servant,

PAMPHILUS.

To the DIRECTORS *of the* THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING long observed with concern among
Protestant Dissenters a practice, which in
itself may be proper and useful, so conducted
as to countenance and support superstition, I
beg leave, through the channel of your valuable
miscellany, to call their attention to some re-
marks, which I have to propose relating to it.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your very humble servant,

A LOVER OF ORDER.

I BELIEVE the following are all or most of the places in the New Testament, where any thing is said about ordaining, appointing, or setting apart, persons for offices in the christian church.

When our Lord sent forth the Seventy into those places, which he intended himself to visit, we do not find that he performed any ceremony before their mission, though in the execution of it they wrought miracles. All that he appears to have done, was to give them directions respecting their conduct, and to invest them with miraculous powers. However, after his ascension, when the place of Judas was to be filled up, and christian churches began to be formed, we read that Matthias was chosen by lot to compleat the number of the apostles, Acts i. 26. that seven deacons were appointed, and received powers to work miracles, vi. 6. 8. that converts in Samaria were ordained and received the Holy Ghost, ver. 17. that Saul was ordained and received the Holy Ghost, ix. 17. that the Holy Ghost fell on all that were with Cornelius while Peter was speaking to them, so that they spake with tongues, x. 44. 46. and received like gifts with the apostles, xi. 15. 17. that hands were laid on Barnabas and Saul, when they were sent out on a particular ministry, xiii. 3, 4. that elders were ordained in Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, though nothing is said of the manner in which they were ordained, xiv. 23. that Paul and Silas were recommended by the brethren to the grace of God; but in what manner is not mentioned, xv. 20. that the Holy Ghost came on about twelve disciples at Ephesus, so that they

Y 2 spake

ſpeak with tongues and prophesied, xix. 6. that deacons were firſt to be proved, and then put into office, 1 Tim. iii. 10. that Timothy received a gift with laying on of the hands of the preſbytery, iv. 14. that he was to lay hands ſuddenly on no man, v. 5. that Titus was to ordain elders in every city, Tit. i. 5.

From the foregoing paſſages we learn, firſt, That apoſtles, deacons and others, when appointed to their reſpective offices, were generally, if not always, furniſhed with miraculous powers. Secondly, That it does not appear, that any perſons ſtood forth profeſſedly as public inſtructors, or performed any miniſterial duty *in* that character, till they were regularly ſet apart: Thirdly, That two of the apoſtles, though before appointed to propagate chriſtianity, and endued with miraculous powers for that purpoſe, were aſreſh recommended to the favour of God, when ſent forth on a ſpecial employment. Fourthly, That care was to be taken by thoſe, whom the apoſtles authoriſed to ordain elders and deacons, to admit ſuch only into thoſe offices as were known to be perſons of approved characters.

I am not aware, that any proteſtant diſſenting miniſters do now pretend to convey any powers by ordaining. However; they ſeem to be totally inattentive to one thing done in the apoſtolic age, by neglecting to recommend miniſters aſreſh to the bleſſing of heaven, when they remove, from one congregation to another. If there was any propriety in imploring the divine favour on the apoſtles, though before confeſſedly

prepared by the gifts of the spirit for the discharge of their important duty, when they were going to enter on the execution of it in some new situation; surely there can be no impropriety, to say the least, in recommending afresh ministers of the present day to the blessing of heaven, when they are about to exercise their office in a different part of the christian church from that in which they were before stationed.

But not to insist on this departure from what appears to have been done in one instance even to apostles, I have other objections to offer to the modern practice of dissenters in the affair of ordination.

When a young man hath finished his studies at an academy, and received from his tutors a certificate, notifying that he is qualified both by his literary attainments, and by his religious and moral conduct, as far as they have fallen under their observation, to officiate in the capacity of a christian minister, he is invited, we will suppose, by some society to become its pastor. He undertakes the charge, and performs the duties of reading the scriptures, preaching and praying. The last of these duties, one of eternal and immutable obligation, and the most solemn that we can conceive any created being to engage in, he is permitted, without the least opposition, to perform, and that for a long time, and in some instances for a series of years. All this while it is thought improper that he should administer the ordinance of baptism or the Lord's supper, ceremonies, that derive their whole obligation from positive appointment,

ment, and which it would be unlawful and presumptuous to perform, if they were not enjoined.

This distinction between different duties of the ministerial office, whatever may have given rise to it, or occasioned its continuance, must have a bad tendency. It suggests the idea of positive rites, which can be obligatory on none but the professors of the particular religion to which they belong, being esteemed more solemn and important than a moral duty, necessarily arising from the relation of all intelligent creatures to their creator, and equally binding upon them at all times and in all circumstances. Accordingly it betrays an apprehension, that more sacredness and purity of character, or that other qualifications, or that greater degrees of certain qualifications than were enjoyed before, are required for the proper performance of the one than of the other.

It tends to make the *laity* imagine, whatever ministers may think or declare, either that there is, or that ministers suppose that there is, more solemnity in the positive rites of a particular religion than in an essential and unalterable duty of all religion; and that something more is, or that ministers think something more to be, necessary to fit a person for duly performing the former than is requisite to prepare him for rightly discharging the latter. That many among the laity entertain such an imagination, to which ministers, by their present conduct, give countenance, is an incontrovertible fact. You may find in dissenting societies, and, I fear, in the greater part of them, persons, who will attend,
with

with approbation and pleasure, one Lord's day on the common public worship, conducted by an unordained minister, who would be shocked at the thought of his baptizing or administering the Lord's supper at that time, though they would not feel the least reluctance to attend him in the performance of either of those rites the very next Lord's day after he hath passed through the ceremony of ordination. I would ask any one, whether this must not arise from wrong notions of the nature and importance of those different duties, and of the circumstances which qualify for the proper discharge of them. I would also ask, whether ministers, let them say what they will to correct those wrong notions, do not help to continue them by their practice in opposing an unordained minister's performing some of the pastoral duties, and consenting to his performance of others. I think every impartial and unprejudiced person must answer both these questions in the affirmative.

I know it is said, that ministers, employed to ordain, are particularly careful to guard the people, assembled on such an occasion, against entertaining those wrong notions. I hope I shall not offend any by what I am going to say, but I must beg leave to observe, that their conduct in this business appears to resemble that of a physician, who should inform his patient, that the apothecary, who was to make up his prescription, was a man of skill and integrity, and that he might be very safely trusted in the present case, having already done several things in the way of his profession of at least equal consequence and
Y 4 difficulty,

difficulty, but that notwithstanding he did not choose to let him prepare and administer the medicine just prescribed, till he and some of his brother physicians had done something to him, which, however, they could not pretend, would render him an abler compounder or a more honest man, or give any additional virtue or efficacy to his physic. The application of the comparison, with the observations it may suggest, I choose to leave the reader himself to make.

Perhaps I shall now be asked, what alteration I would propose to be made in the conduct of ordinations. Before I give my answer, I would observe. First, That I do not discover in the New Testament a single instance of any person in the apostolic age, first acting for a time in the capacity of a teacher of christianity, and afterwards receiving an appointment to that office; though I find one of the apostles being afresh recommended to the divine blessing, when they were going to be sent out upon a particular ministry.

2. That as I cannot perceive any ground for supposing, that, before elders were ordained in the different churches, the christian converts neglected any of the positive institutions of their religion, it does not appear to me, that the primitive christians looked upon the observance of those institutions as useless or improper, when they practised them among themselves, without the assistance of public officers set apart for the work of the ministry, and that therefore the serious and conscientious observance of them *now*, where such assistance may be wanting, ought not

not to be regarded as invalid, irregular, or unprecedented.

The alteration I would propose is this, that, instead of letting young men exercise any part of the ministerial function before they are ordained, they be introduced into office by ordination. Let their tutors, from whom they receive testimonials, solemnly exhort them to diligence and fidelity in the work before them, and implore with them the blessing of heaven on their future labours in the ministry, either privately in the lecture-room of the academy, or (which I think is preferable) publicly in some meeting-house. Then let them be recommended by a certificate, drawn up and signed by their tutors, and any others who can attest their characters and qualifications, to the attention and choice of any vacant congregations, which may want and desire their services; and let them enter, as soon as chosen and settled in such congregations, on the discharge of every ministerial duty. Against such a practice as this I can foresee no objection, unless it be improper (which I suppose no christian will allow) for a person, when he is going to embark in some laudable undertaking, to beg himself the favour of God, and to ask the pious wishes and prayers of his friends for his success. The intercessions of good men for young persons in those circumstances are justifiable and becoming on the same grounds, as are those which are offered up for the sick, the young, the aged, the absent, or any others, in christian societies.

Perhaps I shall be told, that ministers should be tried for some time by societies, that they may

may have opportunities of discovering their real characters and qualifications, before they permit them to be ordained.

I answer, that it is equally necessary at least to ascertain these, as far as it can be done, before societies allow them to conduct their common devotions—that otherwise they appear to set inferior duties of a positive nature above another that is superior, immutable, everlasting, and independent of any positive appointment—and that, if they esteem the testimonials of tutors and others sufficient to justify them in permitting ministers to discharge among them the most solemn and important duty, while they notwithstanding restrain them from performing merely positive ceremonies, they betray unwarrantable and superstitious ideas of the latter, which it becomes dissenting ministers, who would approve themselves the friends of rational religion, to endeavour to eradicate.

Were the alteration proposed respecting the time of ordaining to be adopted, far more would be done by such a step toward removing the superstition, which a Hoadley, a Priestley, and a Bell have been labouring in their excellent treatises on the Lord's supper to cure, than can ever be done by a few remarks, introduced for that purpose into ordination-services, while the conduct of those who make them, in opposing the administration of the two positive rites of christianity by ministers before ordination, seems to speak so different a language. I would, therefore, as a friend to rational religion, to the cause of a protestant dissent, to consistency of conduct, and

and to young persons whose circumstances may induce them to comply with the present custom in opposition to their convictions, request the attention of all tutors of dissenting academies, of dissenting ministers in general, and of others who may be able to help forward a reform, to the alteration I have suggested. I cannot foresee any difficulty in making it, or any objection to its being made, unless it be such as, I presume, the principles of consistent and judicious dissenters will not suffer them to mention.

Remarks on Eubulus.

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

THE subject discussed by Eubulus has often appeared to me to have its peculiar difficulties, and I was glad to see his remarks upon it, though they militate against the common opinion and practice, and my own prepossessions. For I promised myself, that they would call the attention of some able judge to the question, and produce that rational, liberal investigation, which to me it appeared to need. The observations, judiciously urged, and fully stated by Philander, have prevented my suffering

sering a disappointment. But as I am of opinion that the subject is not exhausted by his pen, I request leave to introduce into your publication some further thoughts upon it.

S U B S I D I A N U S,

EUBULUS seems to confound the observation of the Lord's day with a Jewish sabbath, as if the former necessarily involved in it the latter. With respect to the latter a cessation from all worldly business was the first and leading object of it; and this does not appear to be justly said of the Lord's day. The law of the Jewish sabbath, was in the first instance a law of rest; and the injunction to keep an holy convocation was subsequent and secondary. The hints given us, in the New Testament, concerning the Lord's day, lead us to consider its primary design to be, to do honour to the Lord, by employing it in christian worship. Now the giving a day to one particular pursuit or employment discriminates and marks that day: and implieth the detaching it from all other engagements. A rest from labour, in the case of the Lord's day, though not the primary design of it, will of course be the consequence of devoting it to sacred uses. Yet that rest may not be so strict and rigorous as to give it the air of a Jewish sabbath, or to entitle it to be considered as one: for which, as Eubulus observes, there is no positive precept in the New Testament. So that this view of the subject establishes a clear and important distinction between a Jewish sabbath and a Lord's day. The latter
is,

is, what I conceive, christians are concerned to defend.

The question therefore is, upon what authority should christians, really influenced by their religion, distinguish one day out of seven by this title and by acts of social devotion?

Here let it be observed, that an allowance should be made for the different modes, by which a divine sanction is derived to the rites of the Old and New Testament. The former constitute part of a code of laws, laid down with great precision, authoritatively defined by the words of the legislator, and assigned to certain periods of time and to certain descriptions of men. The latter, at least in the full extent and with regard to every particular application, are not the subject of explicit, set, and formal laws: but are incidentally introduced, as facts or events gave occasion, and wear more the appearance of *customs* than *injunctions*. The reason of this difference in the mode of promulgation may be supposed to be this: the former were appointed to a people, at one time, separated from the world, and formed into a peculiar, religious, and political body. The latter were to be practised by those who were still to continue in their secular and worldly connexions. *There* a nation was concerned: *Here* only a few individuals, as they were, singly or in small parties, brought over to the christian faith; but in other respects were blended with the mass to which they originally belonged. The ritual of the Jews was at once completely formed and established: the christian ritual was gradually to gain ground and to insinuate

nuate itself, as opportunity permitted. Thus they are handed down to us, as *customs* which incidentally arose, and gradually spread.

E. G. We are assured "that Christ and his
 " Apostles baptized many Jews in his life
 " time: John iii. 22. iv. 1, 2. Yet the evan-
 " gelists do not give us an account of the in-
 " stitution of this baptism. The institution we
 " read Matt. xxviii. 19. was of baptism for the
 " na ions, or the Gentiles, long after the fore-
 " mentioned baptism for the Jews that believed
 " in Christ*." Thus also we find by the case of
 the Corinthians, and by several passages in the
 Acts, that the Lord's supper was adopted by
 every church, and observed by all converts to the
 gospel; yet the first injunction, *strictly* explained,
 extended only to that company of disciples with
 which Christ first eat it. But this practice of the
 first christian churches, especially as corroborated
 by the republication of the ordinance, 1 Cor.
 vi. 23. &c. shews that it was meant to carry with
 it an universal and perpetual obligation. We
 may conclude, therefore, that they acted upon
 the injunction of Christ, though that injunction
 be not expressly recorded. "So the Lord's day
 " may be a divine institution, though we have
 " not in the gospel an account of the particular
 " time when it was first appointed. It is natural
 " enough to suppose, that it was after Christ's
 " resurrection, when he spake to the apostles of
 " the things pertaining to the kingdom of God†."

* Hallet's notes and observations, vol. iii. p. 173.

† Id. p. 173.

Eubulus

Eubulus however asserts, "that the apostles
"and first disciples of Jesus Christ, are no where
"said to have distinguished the first day of the
"week in any manner whatsoever." The pas-
sages usually alleged, as proofs that the first day
of the week was not only distinguished from other
days by the first christians, but distinguished by
acts of worship, are quoted by him; but he
judges them to be totally inconclusive to the
purpose for which they are alleged. And one
passage in the Revelations, it is to be observed,
is entirely omitted by him.

The first text, John xx. 19. 26. it must be
granted, does not specify the end for which the
disciples were assembled together. It might be,
as he supposes, merely to confer together on the
testimony and evidence of their master's resur-
rection: but, as this fact was not fully ascertained
to their conviction, their meeting could not be
in honour of it. The other texts, notwithstand-
ing what Eubulus has offered to invalidate their
force, appear to me clear and satisfactory.

Acts xx. 7. deserves particular attention.
*And upon the first day of the week, when the dis-
ciples were come together to break bread, Paul
preached unto them (ready to depart on the morrow)
and continued his speech unto midnight.* This
passage, in my opinion, is full and explicit. It
asserts the repetition of a general custom, of
which without calling a meeting, Paul availed
himself, that he might preach unto them. "And
"by assembling with them, and preaching to
"them, at that time Paul approved of their cus-
"tom, and recommended it to us. If they had
"done

“ done wrong in keeping up this custom, Paul
 “ would have shown his dislike of it, as he al-
 “ ways honestly did on all such occasions: wit-
 “ nesses his reproving the Corinthians for the ill
 “ customs crept in amongst them: and his
 “ blaming Peter to the face. Gal. ii. 11—14*.”

The next passage is 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. *Now as concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so even do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come.* Mr. Locke's remark here is pertinent and forcible. “ It is certain, that the apostle directs, that
 “ they should every Lord's day bring to the
 “ congregation what their charity had laid aside
 “ the foregoing week, as their gain came in,
 “ that there it might be put into some public
 “ box appointed for that purpose, or officer's
 “ hands. For if they had only laid it aside at
 “ home, there would nevertheless be need of a
 “ collection, when he came.” It may be added, that “ when the apostle told the church what
 “ they should do, when for the *time to come*,
 “ they should meet for worship on the Lord's
 “ day; he did as good as order them to persist
 “ in this custom of observing this day in this
 “ religious manner†.”

The last passage in Rev. i. 10. *I was in the spirit on the Lord's day.* It is obvious, that this title marks one day above the rest: and which that day was, is apparent from the uniform prac-

* Hallet, ut supra. p. 181, 182. † Hallet, p. 185.

tice of the christians who lived next after the apostles, of applying this name to the first day of the week. Mr. Hallet, from parallel passages, in which the title *the Lord's* is applied to any thing, has shewn that it not only indicates something set apart to the honour of Christ, but also an appointment of his.

These passages, it must be allowed, are few, very few; only three: yet on the authority of these few texts, is it supposed, that an institution, reaching to all churches and to all ages, doth depend; and, as I apprehend, the conclusion is made with propriety and weight. For, though it appears, that the Lord's day, or the first day of the week, as a day devoted to the honour of the Lord, and to christian worship, is seldom mentioned in the original, authentic records of the first planting of christianity: yet be it observed, the force of the argument in favour of the day does not lie in the *number* of times the mention of it occurs; but in the *manner*, in which it is spoken of. It is mentioned, though incidentally, as a *custom*, as a *fixed* and *regular custom*; as a custom pervading different churches, and different parts of the christian world, Troas, Galatia, and Corinth. Much is implied in such a mention of it. It is tantamount to frequent references to it, to the enumeration of many instances of the observance of it. It comprehends many *instances in one*. The name *the Lord's day*, is very emphatical, and holds forth the general fixed estimation of its nature and design. These testimonies, which prove that this custom was, the earliest period, introduced into the christian

VL

Z

tian

tian church, and had an extensive spread, are clear and weighty: as appears from the authors to which Philander refers.

But Eubulus doth not see that force in these texts from the Acts and 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. which is commonly ascribed to them. If he means, that they do not prove the observance of a sabbath, strictly and fully, conformable to the rigour of a Jewish sabbath, he is certainly right. But they plainly go to prove, that the first day of the week was distinguished by christian worship: and so far at least, by a separation of it from the common pursuits of life. Eubulus indeed asserts, that the meeting spoken of in the “first” of these passages was evidently in the very beginning of the first day of the week, i. e. in the evening, after the business of the preceding day was over. And, as the historian assures us, that Paul both intended, and did actually set out on his journey at break of day. “This passage of scripture affords us a decisive proof that St. Paul had no idea of keeping the first day of the week as a sabbath.”

On what principles this is so evident to Eubulus, that sensible writer has not pointed out to us. With just respect for the abilities which, in the discussion of this subject, he has discovered, I must say, that the assertion is not only unsupported; but incompatible with the language of the text. The term, the *first day of the week*, *ἡ πρώτη τοῦ σαββάτου*, occurs Mat. xxviii. 1. *In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.* Mark

Mark xvi, 1, 2. *And very early in the morning, in the first day of the week, they came to the sepulchre, at the rising of the sun.* Luke xxiv. 1. *Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre.* John xx. 1. *The first day of the week came Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark.* These are all the places, besides the two passages under consideration, where we meet with the phrase. And, though the Jewish civil day began at the setting of the sun, yet, in each of these places the phrase denotes that part of the civil day which succeeded to the sun-rising, or the hours of light: which sense of the word *day*, is very common in scripture*.

It would be contrary to the analogy of language to understand it otherwise in the text before us. The *morrow* must stand opposed to *this* sense of the word, *day*, and signify the next period of light, which was Monday: otherwise the writer of the acts would be chargeable with referring, in the same clause to two different measures of time. And the Greek word, *επαυριον*, will, I believe, be always found to stand thus opposed to the meaning of the word, *day*, as signifying the time of light. Besides, as Paul set out on his journey at break of day, the time of his departure according to the computation adopted here by Eubulus, does not agree with the reason assigned for holding the meeting till midnight; which was his eagerness to depart

* See Lardner's Observations on Dr. Macknight's Harmony, p. 10.

on the morrow. For this day-break, on such computation, was not the *morrow*, of the *first* day of the week, but a *part of that day*, which had commenced the evening before, at sun-setting: the morrow of *it* did not commence till the succeeding evening.

These are decisive proofs that the christian meeting was held on the Sunday evening, and that Pau.'s journey was designedly postponed to Monday: proofs, that if he did not keep a jewish Sabbath, yet he did not travel on the first day of the week; but to avoid that, submitted to the inconvenience of holding a meeting till midnight, which the calling the christians together, on the preceding evening, at the close of the jewish Sabbath, would have prevented.

The historian does not inform us, at *what hour* the disciples came together. It was probably late in the day. The christians, in that early period, could not act as we now do in countries where christianity is established, and where we enjoy the convenience and protection of a national law, prohibiting to the whole body of the people all secular employment on the first day of the week: but they were obliged to hold their religious associations, as their situation permitted. Just as it has always been in times of persecution, and in the infancy of a religious interest: when pious persons adapt the hours and time of their meeting to the necessities of their condition. When these necessities, or difficulties cease, they choose the portions of time for the purpose of their religious association according to the principles, on which they allot the seasons for other transactions,

transactions. What they did before early in the morning, or late at night, they do then in the full and open day.

This will account, I apprehend, why the observation of the first day of the week for religious and christian worship is spoken of in the writers of the succeeding ages of the church, without any direct mention of a cessation from labours, as what discriminated and occupied the day: till Constantine, finding what was the practice of the christians passed it into a law, and enacted an universal rest from the occupations of life; it may be presumed, to ingratiate himself with so large a body of the people, by a law, which would give the royal sanction to their custom, and screen them from the opposition and insults of their pagan neighbours. Whether Constantine, in this, acted consistently with the attention which he ought to have paid to the rights of his other subjects; whether he acted upon any grounds which the principles of christianity suggests and justifies; or whether any prince, in succeeding ages hath, from the principles of government, justly and liberally explained, much more from the spirit and principles of christianity, any right to debar his subjects, without their consent, of a seventh portion of their time, are questions not connected, I conceive, with the obligations under which conscientious christians lie to set apart to the Lord the first day of the week, and to distinguish it by acts of christian worship. In this respect, as well as in every thing that concerns religion they are to act, not upon human authority,

thority, but from the conviction of their own minds, doing what they *do heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; considering that they serve the Lord Christ.*

It appears to me, that Eubulus has not adverted to the distinction, which this question admits, between the duty and obligation lying on christians, I mean sincere and serious christians, to observe the first day of the week to the Lord, and the interference of the magistrate to appoint a day of universal cessation from the occupations of life; which is only to enforce idleness where he cannot implant piety. To this the New Testament giveth no sanction. But doth it not speak to the *piety* of christians; to their sense of religion, to their zeal for the christian cause, to their concern for mutual edification, by shewing what the first christians did? See the first part of Philander's Remarks, and Mr. Hallet's *Discourse on the Lord's Day*; wherein the observance of it is placed on the proper grounds.

Eubulus, I would farther observe does not appear to have taken into consideration the natural obligations to the worship of the Deity, nor many other arguments which his disquisition hath given Philander an opportunity ably and fully to represent. He has not, I conceive, made a due allowance for the natural disposition of the human mind to add the aids of society to every pursuit; and for the vast importance of those aids to the improvement and comfort of individuals, and to the advancement and support of a common cause. From this disposition,
most

most wisely given to us by our Maker, originate all associations ; our literary societies, our academies of science, and our various clubs. Christianity, that most benevolent system, can never be unfavourable to the exertion of that principle. Under its auspices, this social propensity shewed itself, from the first planting of that divine faith, with energy and glory ; and wherever the gospel was received, churches were formed.

Hence, without deriving the observation of the Lord's day from the fourth commandment, without extending or perpetuating the obligations of that command, these churches fixed on the day of Christ's resurrection for the purposes of *their* religious association : and, if not commanded to do it, were certainly countenanced and supported in it, by the apostles. A custom, of this antiquity and authority, as well as utility, deserves to be perpetuated in the churches, and to become a law for all christians through all ages.

To,

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY:

GENTLEMEN,

IF the following observations should not be thought impertinent to your excellent work; the insertion will oblige a sincere well-wisher to your undertaking.

PHILALETHES.

YOUR very intelligent correspondent, Pamphilus, seems to think, page 124 of vol. v. there is great difficulty in the right interpretation of the following passage of Isaiah. I shall give it as translated by M. D. in the *Commentaries and Essays*, "In the former time he debased the land of Zebulun and the land of Nephthali; but in the latter time, he hath made them glorious, even the way of the sea, along the Jordan, Galilee of the nations. The people which walked in darkness have seen a great light; they who dwelled in the land and shadow of death, to them hath the light shined." Does this language seem to suit with the circumstances of the times of Hezekiah? I must confess it does not strike me so. May not the distinction of the *former* times, denote the dreadful calamities which the land has suffered by the long captivity and dispersion of the ten tribes; and that the *latter* time, a period yet to come, God will make them glorious, by
making

making the wealth of the nations flow into them *by the way of the sea*, along the Jordan? as foretold elsewhere. See *Zechariah xiv. 14.*

I by no means see the necessity of supposing that the times of the gospel are here alluded to, for the reasons Pamphilus has given. And I entirely agree with him, that the Prophet proceeds to describe such a joy as is inspired by *temporal prosperity* only. See ver. 2 to 5.

And may not this more naturally relate to the time, when the future restorer of Israel and Judah shall arise, deliver his people from their long captivity and restore them to their own land? which it is likewise foretold, will be attended with very great slaughter and bloodshed. See *Joel iii. ver. 1 and 2. Zechariah xii. and Daniel xii.*

With how much greater propriety, may it be said of him, than of Hezekiah, that he shall be called, "The messenger of the great design, the
" father of the age, the prince of peace; of the
" increase of his government and peace there
" shall be no end, on the throne of David, and
" on his kingdom to fix it, and to establish it,
" with judgment and justice henceforth and for
" ever." See chap. x. ver. 12. and chap. xii. to the end; M. D.'s translation.

The Jews of those times are encouraged to hope for success. They are informed that there is a child even born to, or amongst them, who shall have the government, and notwithstanding the seeming improbability of the thing, it is confirmed to them in these words, "the zeal of
" Jehovah, God of Hosts, will do this."

Z *

The

The greatest objection to this interpretation is verse the 7th, &c. But may not verse the 7th to chap. x. ver. 12. relate only to those present times? verse the 12th seems to favour my hypothesis. It is no unusual thing in the scriptures, in speaking of present calamity, or prosperity, to allude to future and greater. The prophet in foretelling their great deliverance in the latter days, chap. xi. ver. 1. very naturally makes mention again of their great deliverer, as he had done in the ninth chapter. I suppose the same person prophesied of in both places, and there is a perfect agreement with respect to the *perpetuity* of his government in both.

Are not nine and twenty years too inconsiderable for so strong an expression as "henceforth" and "for ever?" but very applicable to the time of the future restoration of the Israelites, who we are told, are to continue so long as the sun and moon endureth, i. e. to the end of time.

But it is still objected that the enemies of the Jews are said to be Assyrians, which undoubtedly limits the prophecy to the time of Hezekiah. But let us attend to the eleventh verse of the eleventh chapter, "And it shall come to pass in that day, Jehovah will again the second time put forth his hand, to recover the remnant of his people, which shall remain from Assyria, &c." The *second time* here must mean their future return; and as the land is denominated Assyria, their enemies who will obstruct the messenger, or leader, of this great design, are called Assyrians. See also ver. 16th of the same chap. and Zechariah x. ver. 10 and 11.

I sincerely

I sincerely hope the study of the prophecies, will make no small part of the papers of your publication; and that Pamphilus will continue to contribute his learned labours for the edification of those, who are made as happy in the perusal of them, as I am.

*Postscript to the Article signed PAMPHILUS,
relating to a Case of a bloody Sweat.*

THE most distinct account that I have met with of any person, as far as appears, in a state of perfect health, sweating blood through terror is given by Thuanus, in the beginning of the eleventh book of his history. The whole passage is as follows. "After the taking of "Dragonera, Maggi was ordered to attack "Montemaro, which was a very strong place. "He took with him Augustus, natural son of "the Count of Saluces, who being intimately "acquainted with the governor, invited him "out on pretence of a conference; when, "as had been agreed between them, Maggi "seized him, and would have persuaded him "to surrender the place. Intreaties failing, he "had recourse to threats; and having bound "him, had him led round the place, as if he "had been going to immediate execution. The "inhabitants, unable to bear the sight, sur-
rendered

248 *An Account of a Person, &c.*

“ rendered the place, to save the life of their
“ governor. It was observed that his mind was
“ so much affected with the prospect of this
“ shameful death, that his whole body was
“ covered with a bloody sweat. *Observatum*
“ *tam indignæ mortis vehementi metu adeo con-*
“ *cussum animo cum fuisse, ut sanguineum sudorem*
“ *toto corpore funderet.*”

*A Postscript to the Observations on the Pec-
cability of Christ, in some Remarks on
Dr. Price's Sermons.*

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

I Have just been perusing a paper, in the third volume of your publication, upon the reasoning of the apostle Paul. The writer, towards the conclusion of it, speaking upon a passage in the epistle to the Romans*, in which he thinks the apostle is chargeable with some oversights, especially in his allusion to the death and resurrection of Christ, says, "We neither *die unto sin*, nor *live unto God* (admitting the propriety of these terms to express a change of life and character) in the same sense in which Christ died unto sin, and lived, or rose again, unto God. For Christ had no sin of his own to die unto, or to cease from: *He died only on account, or in consequence of our sins*; whereas we, by dying unto sin, really cease from sin. Again, by Christ's living unto God, must be meant *his rising again by the power of God his Father*; whereas our living unto God, must be understood in a different manner, viz. our living according to the will of God†."

* Rom. vi. 2—12.

† Theol. Repos. vol. iii. p. 105.

To me, I confess, it seems highly improbable that the apostle should use the words *dying unto sin*, in the sense which is here put upon them. In the second and eleventh verses, he speaks of our being dead unto sin, and evidently means a freedom from evil dispositions and habits. Now is it by any means likely, that in strict and close connexion with these verses, he should adopt the very same expression, and mean nothing more by it than dying on account of, or in consequence of other men's sins? One should imagine that the most careless writer would scarcely be guilty of such an inconsistency, especially when the whole force of his argument depended upon the words conveying in both places one precise and determinate idea, which will be perceived to be the case in the present instance by every one, who will give himself the trouble of perusing the chapter.

If, then, by Christ's dying unto sin, the apostle meant the same as by our dying unto sin; could he have entertained those conceptions of the impeccability of his Master, which are so generally entertained by modern christians? Surely he would not have spoken of his *dying unto sin*, when he left the world; if he had imagined that Christ had *never*, whilst in the world, been *capable* of sinning. Nor can we well suppose that in the warmth of argument he should forget this circumstance. It is not a single step inadvertently introduced in the middle of a train of reasoning; but it is the very foundation of the whole, and the idea which must have given birth to the argument itself. Indeed, had the apostle considered Christ as
impeccable,

Impeccable, and no more capable of sinning whilst on earth, than when ascended up into heaven; one should imagine that this idea would so intimately have associated itself with other ideas concerning his Master, that the argument which he introduces in this chapter, would never have suggested itself to his mind. His introducing of it is scarcely to be accounted for but upon the supposition that he looked upon Christ as capable of sinning, and, therefore, of dying unto sin as well as other men.

Admitting then, that this was the apostle's idea, his reasoning in the place before us, is cleared of one considerable difficulty, and indeed of an appearance of great absurdity. It follows, also, that by *living unto God*, the apostle may mean his living according to the will of God in a still higher degree than it was possible for him ever to have done before, and not merely his rising by the power of God, as it is interpreted in the passage quoted from your Repository.

If these remarks be just, they tend to confirm the observations upon this subject, which were lately offered to the consideration of your candid readers, and therefore corroborate the interpretations which were then given to those texts, which seem to represent our Lord as absolutely free from every kind of sin; or at least they favour the general idea that such texts assert no more than that he was possessed of a very high degree of moral excellence.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your's most respectfully,

D A V I D E S.

Nov. 20, 1787.

A a 2

To

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

I Fear the reply I here send you to Philander's remarks upon my objections to the institution of a sabbath amongst christians may reach you too late for its insertion in the third number of your sixth volume. But my attention having been necessarily drawn off to other objects, I have not, till now, found leisure to take notice of that gentleman's two letters, and can only request the favour of you to give this reply a place in your very useful publication, as soon as it may be convenient.

The observance of a sabbath can be considered only in a political, a moral, and a religious point of view. In each of these I considered it in my former letter: and urged arguments against such an institution, in all these respects, which appeared to me unanswerable, as being founded upon the very nature of things, and confirmed by the experience of fourteen centuries in one part, and by the express testimony of the earliest christian writers in another. And after all that Philander has thought fit to allege against them, as far as I am capable of judging, they still remain in full force.

If it be the best policy in civil magistrates to encourage and excite to the utmost the industry of the people they govern (as it most indisputably is) it is manifest that, to establish an institution which

which utterly annihilates one-seventh part of the national industry, is exceeding bad policy.

This, indeed, is so obvious an axiom, that Philander does not attempt to controvert it. But he seems to think he has confuted the objections I made to the modern sabbath, considered both in a moral and a religious light. And, what surprized me not a little, his only argument, which can be supposed to have any weight, is founded upon an idea, that, the reason of the institution of the sabbath amongst the Jews, and of all the severe penalties whereby it was enforced was, because the observance was necessary to the moral virtue of that people. If so, why was not that observance, as well as the rite of circumcision, enjoined upon Abraham and all his descendants before Moses? Does Philander think that the great patriarch and his progeny, before their departure out of Egypt, were really more immoral than the Jewish nation was after the promulgation of the fourth commandment? Neither that gentleman, nor any person, who has read the Bible, can imagine so. The truth is that, as God instituted the rite of circumcision to be a sign of the covenant made by him with the father of the faithful, which should distinguish the family of Abraham from the rest of the world, before it became a nation, so he ordained the sabbath afterwards to be a sign of the covenant made with the Jews by the mediation of Moses, which should distinguish them from all the other nations of the earth.

This is the very account of its institution which God himself gives of it, both by Moses and the prophet Ezekiel, though Philander seems unacquainted with any other reason for it besides its supposed moral tendency. In Ex. xxxi. 13. God says, by Moses, to the children of Israel, "*my sabbath ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations,*" and verse 16. "*wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever.*" To the very same purport Ezek. xx. 11 and 12, "*I gave them my statutes and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also, I gave them my sabbaths to be a sign between me and them.*" Where an evident distinction is made between those ordinances of the Jewish law which were intended to be a moral rule of life, and were alone requisite, and sufficient for salvation, and the merely political institution of the sabbath, which was only a sign of the covenant made by God with that people. And from hence appears the true reason why particular violations of the sabbath were ordered to be punished with so much greater severity than any ordinary instances of immorality, even with the death of the offender: and why their national transgressions of the same sort are declared to be punished with the excision or captivity of the whole nation. Because the non-observance of the sabbath was a rejection of that covenant of which it was made.

made the perpetual sign, and an act of open treason and rebellion against the theocracy under which they lived; crimes which every government in the world finds it absolutely necessary to punish with banishment or death. So far, therefore, is the institution of the sabbath among the Jews from being a reason for its observance among christians, that the declared intent of it as a distinguishing sign of that partial covenant, shews it to be as improper for the universal covenant of Christ, which in its very nature puts an end to all marks of distinction amongst mankind, as the rite of circumcision itself.

With respect to the moral or immoral tendency of an institution, which puts a stop to all the usual occupations of the people, and obliges them to spend one-seventh part of their lives in idleness, a judicious and accurate observer of human nature must see that, in the common course of things, its tendency will necessarily be immoral. And to expect that the bulk of the people, who are habituated to an active employment of six days of the week, should spend the seventh in insipid idleness, or abstracted meditation, is nearly as unreasonable as it were to expect the earth, at regular periods, to stand still, and the sun to revolve round it. Of the generality of the working orders of men, as well as of children, it may with truth be said; *when they are doing nothing, they are doing mischief.* And to be convinced of this, one needs only to survey the state of alehouses, and other places of public entertainment, with those scenes of intemperance, or extravagant dissipation, which

present themselves every sabbath, not only in the metropolis and its environs, but in every populous town and village in the kingdom. And for the pernicious influence, which this inevitable abuse of the idleness of Sunday has upon the morals of the people, I appeal not only to the confession of dying malefactors, and the arguments alleged in favour of Sunday-schools, to which I appealed in my former letter, but also to the *brutum fulmen* of the late royal proclamation, which was merely an official paper, issued of course in every reign, at a period (if I mistake not) of about twenty years, and which serves only to prove, that notwithstanding the interposition of the magistrates as far as they find it practicable, the vicious immorality of the people still continues, and by natural consequence is increased; and that government itself is convinced, that this deplorable corruption of the public manners is greatly owing to what, in common cant, is called the prophanation of the sabbath, but is, in truth, only the inevitable abuse of a most unnecessary and impolitic institution of the superstition of the fourth century.

Among the Jews, the divine author of the institution guarded against this fatal consequence, by the very rigid manner in which it was ordered to be observed, and the severe punishment of every violation of it. Not only all business and travelling, but all social, pleasurable intercourse with each other was prohibited; and each family was, in a manner circumscribed within the limits of its own dwelling, except during the hours of attendance at the temple, or in the synagogue,

synagogue. And if modern legislators will persist in establishing by law a similar cessation from the ordinary occupations of civil life, and really wish to prevent the immoral and pernicious abuses of the idleness they alone ordain, they should imitate also the rigid severity of the Jewish law, and (if they think it right, or even practicable) punish every offender with death. But as the institution of the sabbath among christians, is, at present, circumstanced, governors themselves are, in a considerable degree, the authors of that very vice and immorality which they thus publicly lament and menace, in useless, insignificant proclamations.

As to what Philander says in page 114, concerning the difficulty of making a sudden transition of our ideas, from worldly affairs to religious reflections, if it does not savour of that enthusiasm which first led men into deserts and monasteries, under the pretence of withdrawing from secular concerns in order to preserve continually *a pious frame of mind*, it is to me unintelligible. I can only say, that, for my part, I am perfectly convinced, unless the dictates of a man's religion be, at all times, so present to his mind and thoughts, in the midst not of business only, but of pleasure and amusement also, as to controul and regulate his conduct even in those circumstances, his piety is not of the least utility either to himself or others, and consequently of no value in the sight of God, or thinking men. And with respect to any benefits arising from religious instructions or admonitions to those who are willing to attend upon

upon them. I again repeat, that they might be much better attained by employing to those purposes an hour or two in an evening after the business of the day is ended, two or three times a week, than by employing three or four hours in that manner every seventh day, and spending the remainder of the day in idleness. So much for the institution of the modern sabbath, considered in a political and a moral point of view. In taking notice of what I had objected against it, considered as an ordinance of the religion of Jesus Christ, Philander has thought fit to charge me (p. 119) with an assertion *contrary to facts*, that is, with a direct falsehood. A charge of so serious a nature as should not have been urged, without the clearest proof, against one whose only motive for writing at all, is the investigation of religious truth, and the important cause of moral virtue.

For the proof of this charge he refers us to his former paper. A paper which I have read over and over, and cannot only not find in it any such proof, but not a single argument besides what is built upon mere conjecture and inferences, as unsupported and unallowable as that extraordinary one in his second paper (p. 121) where he infers, that Paul *tarried several days at Troas*, to spend the Lord's day with the disciples, because *he basted to be at Jerusalem*. The only argument which appears to me intended to controvert my assertion, that *in the holy scriptures, the apostles and first disciples of Jesus Christ are nowhere said to have distinguished the first day of the week in any manner whatsoever*, is contained in
his

his second paper, p. 119 and 120, where he mentions a passage in St. John, not taken notice of by me, in which the disciples are said to be assembled together in the evening, eight days after the evening that followed the day of our Lord's resurrection. This passage I omitted as nothing to the purpose, especially since the first day of the week is not mentioned in it; first because I had observed that, according to the Jewish computation of time, every day began about our six o'clock in the afternoon, and as our Lord confessedly rose from the dead upon the first day of the week, *from the lateness of the hour at which the two disciples must have returned from Emmaus to Jerusalem, it is certain that the evening-assembly mentioned John xx. 10. and in the parallel passage of St. Luke* (and consequently the assembly holden eight days after) *was not upon the first, but on the beginning of the second day of the week.* And secondly, because, in the words immediately following, I had remarked, that nothing in the practice of the apostles previous to the feast of Pentecost could be of any obligation to us. Yet Philander, without taking the slightest notice of these two difficulties, and though it is notorious, that the apostles did not even understand the gospel themselves at that early period; and were so far from instituting ordinances for the universal observance of future christians, that they did not attempt to teach the religion of Jesus Christ, till they had received the miraculous pledge and proof of their commission above thirty days after, chooses, to persist in calling the day on which these meetings were

were holden *the first day of the week*, and to conjecture that from this last meeting is to be dated the commencement of the christian custom of solemnizing the Lord's day.

But I will not waste my own or the readers time in a controversy about fanciful inferences and conjectures, or about the meaning or *authenticity* of one particular word in the apocalypse. I must repeat that, considering the institution of the sabbath among christians as an ordinance of a religion intended to be universal, which therefore tends to annihilate one-seventh part of the industry of all mankind, and compels them to pass one-seventh part of their lives in useless inactivity, or the too natural abuses of that periodical idleness which cannot but be pernicious to moral virtue; no less authority can be sufficient for its establishment than the express command of the author of the religion, as fully and clearly delivered as that for the sabbath of the seventh day under the Jewish law, or for the commemorative rite of the Lord's supper under the gospel. Unless, therefore, the defenders of the modern sabbath of the first day, as a religious ordinance can produce such a command, they really do nothing. However, well knowing the pertinacity with which mankind adhere to customs they have been long habituated to, without any regard to their origin, or the reasonableness or unreasonableness of their institution, I should not have attempted to call the attention of the public to this subject, important as it is, if it had not been demonstrable, beyond all doubt, that no such ordinance as the sabbath

sabbath was observed by christians till after the second century; and that no such observance was enjoined upon them before the reign of Constantine, who, by the interposition of his civil power, established, not the religion of Jesus Christ, but that idolatrous, blasphemous superstition, the very apostacy from the true religion of the gospel, which is the peculiar object of almost all the prophecies of the New Testament.

Philander, indeed, does not deny that Constantine first publicly enjoined the observance of the sabbath, but concludes, that he found it in the practice of christians before his time, and therefore established it by law.

That he did not find it in the practice of christians in general is evident, because he would then have established it universally, and not in cities and large towns only. But it is indeed, by no means improbable, that he found it among some professed christians, as he did the celibacy of monks, the use of the sign of the cross, the veneration of saints and martyrs, and the vestiges of almost every other superstitious practice, that was afterwards adopted into general usage by the hierarchies of both the eastern and western churches.

Philander seems to know no difference between the first christians assembling together for religious purposes at some appointed hour of the first day of the week, and their keeping the whole day as a sabbath; and his way of arguing is, "from such and such circumstances or expressions, I infer, it seems highly probable, and
" I think

"*I think* that the apostles and first christians did
 "abstain from all worldly occupations on the
 "first day of the week; and that succeeding
 "christians continued to observe the new sab-
 "bath, thus approved and instituted by the
 "example, though not by the precept of the
 "apostles." And this he is pleased to call *proof*
and demonstration.

Now, though, in my judgment, Philander has not in the least refuted the arguments I drew from the apostolic decree and St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians: and I am convinced, that, if they had themselves kept or encouraged the keeping a sabbath on the first day of the week, they would have contradicted their own plain precepts and instructions, and consequently that their having done so is, in the highest degree, improbable; yet that the christians of the second century practised every observance which they had received as an ordinance of the christian religion, from either the precept or the example of the apostles, there cannot be a doubt. But whether they observed any day as a sabbath, or not, is not a point to be determined by Philander's or my inferences and conjectures, but by the written evidence of those christians themselves.

To them I appealed, in my former letter, as expressly asserting (though they inform us of their assembling for religious purposes, on the first day of the week) *that neither had the gospel enjoined, nor did they practise any such observance as a sabbath.* If therefore Philander has never read the writings of the very few christians of
 the

the second century, whose works are come down to us, he was not qualified to argue upon the question; if he has, his pretending to conclude, in opposition to their own clear testimony, that they did observe a sabbath, is unpardonable.

However, to put the matter of fact out of all doubt with those readers who may not be acquainted with the writings of that early period, I will translate a few passages out of Justin the martyr (who has given us a most explicit account of the time and purport of their religious assemblies, and every thing transacted in them, and to whom all those commentators must refer, whose opinions seem to pass for gospel, with Philander).

In his dialogue with Trypho (p. 227. Ed. Par.) he informs us, the Jew objected against the Christians that, *though they boasted of the truth of their religion, and wished to excel other people, they differed in nothing from the heathen in their manner of living; because they neither observed festivals nor sabbaths, nor the rite of circumcision.* To this objection, according to Philander's state of the case, the christian should have replied, that it was not justly founded so far as concerned the sabbath; for that they did keep one, only, for reasons peculiar to their religion, they had transferred it from the seventh to the first day of the week. But instead of this Justin acknowledges the whole charge to be true; and sets himself to prove, that under the new law and universal covenant of the gospel, the external signs of carnal circumcision, and a temporal sabbath were unnecessary and incapable of answering the

the purposes of the new religion. *There is now (says he, p. 229) need of another kind of circumcision; and you think highly of that in your flesh. The new law will have you keep a perpetual sabbath, and you, when you have passed one day in idleness, think you are religious, not knowing why that was commanded you. The Lord our God is not pleased with such things as these. If any among you is guilty of perjury or fraud, let him cease from those crimes; if he is an adulterer, let him repent, and he will have kept the kind of sabbath truly pleasing to God. (In p. 241) Do you see that the elements are never idle nor keep a sabbath? Continue as you were created. For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, nor of the observation of the sabbath, and festivals, and oblations before Moses, neither now likewise is there any need of them after Jesus Christ, &c. In p. 245, he says, Tell me, why did not God teach those to perform such things, who preceded Moses and Abraham, just men, of great renown, and who were well pleasing to him, though they neither were circumcised nor observed sabbaths? And, p. 261, As therefore circumcision began from Abraham, and the sabbath, sacrifices, and oblations from Moses; which, it has been shewn, were ordained on account of your nation's hardness of heart, so according to the council of the Father, they were to end in Jesus Christ the Son of God, &c.*

Other passages of the same purport might be quoted, not only from this writer, but also from Irenæus and Tertullian (The former of whom, by the way, cites the very same passages that I have cited out of Exodus and Ezekiel to prove,

that the sabbath was at first ordained merely as a distinguishing sign of the Mosaic covenant, and not for any moral purpose, or for any reason which made it necessary to mankind in general.) But I persuade myself, there are abundantly sufficient to convince Philander himself, and every candid reader, that the christians of the second century did not observe, and consequently had not received, any such institution from the apostles of Jesus Christ and their immediate disciples: but, on the contrary, that they understood the doctrine of the gospel (as it seems to me every unprejudiced reader of the acts of the apostles, and St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians must do) to teach, that the sabbath as well as circumcision, and every other Jewish ordinance, was abolished by the new covenant, and not unnecessary only, but improper to be adopted into the practice of the disciples of Jesus Christ.

Thus, Gentlemen, I trust, it is clearly evident, that the modern institution of a christian sabbath, or day of cessation from worldly business, whether it be considered in a political, a moral, or a religious point of view, is absolutely indefensible.

Whether my feeble voice may excite the attention either of our governors, or any number of my fellow citizens, I cannot judge. And, if it should, that it will have any efficacy in persuading them to relinquish so long-continued a prejudice, is much more than I presume to hope for. By whatever means it may be accomplished, we are, however, assured, that the whole fabric of anti-christian superstition, which

VOL. VI. B b has

has been so fatally erected and upheld by Constantine and his successors in the civil power of Europe, shall, at length, be utterly demolished. In the mean time, having, to the best of my poor abilities, endeavoured to explode an erroneous practice of a very pernicious tendency, and shewn that though it is generally supposed to be an ordinance of the religion of Jesus Christ, it is, really, only a groundless institution of that very predicted superstition, I have discharged my own duty, and am,

Gentlemen,

Your most obedient humble Servant,

EUBULUS.

To the DIRECTORS *of the* THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

FROM some particular circumstances it happened, that I did not see your third number nor, consequently, *Subsidiarius's* remarks, till some time after I had sent you my reply to Philander; and though, in my own judgment, an institution *detaching one day in seven from all other engagements, and devoting it to sacred uses*, is much too important in its consequences to society to rest upon no better foundation,

dation, than mere inferences, deduced by any body, from ambiguous passages of scripture; yet, as Subsidiarius acknowledges the passages from whence the apostolic sanction of such an institution is deduced to be but three, and assures us, those three appear to him *clear and satisfactory*; and that, in particular, from the *Acts full and explicit*; it will perhaps be thought right that I should explain why I understand the two first of those passages so differently from these Gentlemen, and why I entirely omitted the passage in the Revelation, upon which they are pleased to lay so great a stress. Subsidiarius, it is to be observed, makes great use of the argumentum ad verecundiam, and confronts me with the names of Hallet and of Locke, in defence of his interpretations. But a sincere friend and prudent investigator of truth, like the God of truth himself, is no respecter of persons; nor will he rely implicitly upon the authority even of a Locke, in a case where he is competent (as, in this, every man of common sense and moderate erudition is) to determine for himself.

In Acts xx. 7. the historian, by mentioning the purpose of the assembly of the disciples, informs us clearly also of the time of the day when it was held: for, he tells us, it was *to break bread*. That is, it was either to partake of one common farewell-meal with the apostle before his departure, or else to celebrate together with him the Lord's Supper. If it was the first, all writers, both sacred and prophane, teach us, that the customary time of their chief and only fixed meal, was in the evening, on the begin-

ning of the Jewish day. If the latter, still, from what St. Paul writes to the Corinthians upon that subject, we know it was, in those days, celebrated according to its first institution, in the evening at the hour of *supper*. If, therefore, this breaking bread of the disciples was, as St. Luke assures us it was, *on the first day of the week*, it must have been on our Saturday evening. For the next evening would have been, according to the Jewish computation of time, on the second day. And I leave it to any person of common sense, who has read the passage, to judge whether St. Paul preached to them one whole night, and set out on his journey on Sunday at break of day, as I understand him to have done; or whether he continued to preach to them two whole nights and the intervening day, and set out on Monday morning as Philander and his auxiliary suppose. Subsidiarius indeeds, avoids the absurdity of so preposterous a predication, by making the disciples assemble on Sunday evening; but as the hour of *breaking bread* on our Sunday evening was on the second day of the week and not the first, he thereby flatly contradicts St. Luke, and if he could be right, the assembly would have no reference to the subject of the present debate. As to the difficulty which he suggests about the word *morrow*, the quibble would really have amazed me, if I did not well know the omnipotence of habitual prejudice. I only beg that Gentleman will take the trouble of reading the six first verses of the fourth chapter of the very same history, and he will there find the same word *morrow* indisputably

putably used, twice, in opposition to the preceding evening, though, with the Jews, the evening and the morning were the same day.

The next passage affords a striking proof how dangerous it is to allow the imagination to infer any doctrine of importance from the words of scripture, which is not expressly taught in them. For inference, like fame, though founded, at first, perhaps, upon slight or no grounds, mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo. From St. Paul's order, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. that *upon the first day of the week*, every one should lay up by him in store, as God had prospered him. Subsidiarius says, Mr. Locke pertinently and forcibly infers that every one was to bring to the congregation, on that day, *what their charity had laid aside the foregoing week as their gain came in, that it might be put into some public box, &c.* and Mr. Hallet carries the inference still farther, in whose words Subsidiarius adds, *when the apostle told the church what they should do when they should meet for worship on the Lord's day, he did as good as order them to persist in this custom of observing this day in this religious manner.* Thus we have here, a change of names from *the first day of the week* to *the Lord's day*; an apostolic command to assemble on that day for religious worship, and to bring to the congregation the portion of their gain destined for charitable uses; and an order for the perpetual observance of the same day in a religious manner, deduced by circumstantial inference, not only without, but even in direct opposition to the plain sense of the apostle's own words. For instead of ordering them to bring

B b 3

their

their alms to the congregation, which is the supposed circumstance that first set all the wheels of this curious inference in motion, St. Paul expressly orders every one to lay up a portion of his gain *by him*, in the Greek, much stronger, *was sabbat*, at his own house, and he was to lay up this charitable quota *making*, or when he made a fund or treasure of what he had gained, for that is the real meaning of the original, and necessarily implies, that every one was to balance his accounts, on that day, for the preceding week. A business which the Jewish converts would not have performed on the sabbath, the day before: and which is as inconsistent with the idea of detaching that day from all secular engagements, and appropriating it to sacred uses in honour of Jesus Christ, as St. Paul's setting out to travel upon it was in the former instance.

As for the expression *the Lord's day* in the first chapter of the Revelation, supposing, for the present, the epistles to the seven churches, and the preface to them, in which only this expression is found, to be the work of the same author, and of the same age with the rest of that prophetic book, it is very far from clear, that the apostle meant by it what has been since called the Lord's day, and consecrated as a new sabbath in pretended honour of Christ. The book of Revelation must have been written prior to several of St. Paul's epistles, because they evidently refer to it; and at a time when, we learn from St. Luke that the Jewish converts and even the apostles themselves continued to observe the law of Moses, and consequently to keep

keep the Jewish sabbath. And since the language of the fourth commandment of that law is, *the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God*, how can it be more improbable or more improper that the figurative writer of the apocalypse should call the Jewish sabbath *the Lord's day*, than that other prophets should call the temple *the Lord's house*? Before it can be admitted therefore, that St. John, by that expression, meant *the first day of the week*, Subsidiarius must perform the impossibility of proving from other authorities, that it was the custom of the apostolic age to call the first day of the week by that name. Till then his urging that passage of scripture in argument is a mere *petitio principii*, an unreasonable taking for granted the very point in debate; which, I trust, I have, in my reply to Philander, demonstrated to be inadmissible.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your most humble Servant,

Oct. 10, 1737.

E U B U L U S.

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

I Request your permission to correct an error that has been pointed out to me in the paper of your ingenious and learned correspondent, *Anglo-Scotus*, entitled, *An Attempt to illustrate John iii. 1—11.* On ver. 9. he saith, “by this question I should suppose Nicodemus to have “been a Sadducee.” This is a singular supposition, and evidently a mistake; for, though it has escaped the notice of *Anglo-Scotus*, the sacred text asserts directly the contrary, ver. 1. *There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews.* It is the more proper and necessary to detect this mistake; because the author, without suspecting the truth of his supposition, argues from it, as corroborating his interpretation of the whole passage.

It is not my design to follow *Anglo-Scotus* through his criticisms, but I would submit it to his judgment and to that of your readers; whether the sense he puts on John iii. 5. making it expressive of two births is not set aside by this single consideration: That the words of Christ being an answer to the question of Nicodemus concerning a *second birth only*, must be understood as explanatory of the nature of *that* birth merely.

I would

I would also observe that Anglo-Scotus seems to have overlooked one discriminating circumstance attending the *manner* of Nicodemus's application to Christ, which I should think, is a clue to the following discourse, viz. that *he came to Jesus by night*. It seems, therefore, that what Christ saith of the new birth is pointed against that covert, timid manner of expressing a reverence for his character, and was meant to imply, and enforce, the open profession of christianity.

I cannot but express my earnest wish, that, as we are deprived, by death, of the valuable investigations of Christophilos; the able writer to whom these strictures refer, would take up and pursue the hint given by Christophilos concerning the change of person at ver. 11. for he appears thoroughly to understand it, and to enter into the force and extent of its application.

The pen being in my hand, I would submit a remark or two by way of solution of some of the difficulties, which, we are informed, laid on Mr. Palmer's mind. He thought, "that our Saviour's instructions to the twelve not to go into any city of Samaria, Matt. x. was hardly consistent with himself having preached, and having acknowledged his true character more explicitly to Samaritans, than he had ever done to any Jews."

This, it should be remembered, was in a casual conversation, when he was out of Judea, and with a people who had no commerce with the Jews; so that it did not fall under public notice, or was likely to be so known as to give umbrage

umbrage to the Jews, and raise their jealousy and envy. It was, like that of healing the daughter of the woman of Syrophenicia, a singular case; in which he exceeded the strict limits of his own commission, and to which those reasons of caution and prudence, that in general determined the line of his conduct, did not apply*. It will be easily allowed, that a step out of the usual course may sometimes be very properly taken: when many weighty reasons lie against its becoming a general and standing method of proceeding. Had Christ given to the twelve a special and explicit order to go into the cities of Samaria, besides that it would have anticipated the future extensive promulgation of the gospel, which, for wise reasons, was not to take place till after his ascension, it would have begotten jealousy and resentment in the minds of the Jews, which with great gentleness and wisdom he always avoided doing: Nor were the twelve themselves prepared to receive and execute such a commission, for they partook of the common prejudices of their countrymen against the Samaritans, and marvelled, when they found him conversing with a woman of that nation.

I would submit it, whether the circumstances under which this conversation was held, do not offer a solution of another difficulty, which the excellent Mr. Palmer felt. He conceived, it seems, that "the explicit acknowledgment of his character, as the Messiah, made to the

* See Locke's Reasonableness of Christianity, 8vo. fifth Edition, 1731, p. 73.

" woman

“woman of Samaria by our Lord himself, was
“hardly consistent with the ignorance of the
“apostles in general of that important truth,
“some time afterwards, as the events are ar-
“ranged in the harmonies.”

This conversation was held, when the disci-
ples were gone into the city to buy meat, ver. 8.
consequently, however, the evangelists came
afterwards to be informed of the particulars of
it, they were not at *that time exactly* acquainted
with them. The Samaritans, it is true, after
the return of the disciples from the city in their
hearing avowed their own faith in him, as the
Messiah. But it doth not appear, that the con-
viction arose from Christ's explicit acknowledg-
ment of that character to *them*. It should seem
to have been produced by their own reflections
on what he otherwise said. *Many more believed
because of his own word; and said unto the woman,
now we believe, not because of thy saying; for we have
heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the
Christ, the Saviour of the world,* i. e. as the words
are well glossed by Dr. Clarke, “we believe
“now, not upon the credit of what thou hast
“reported; but because we ourselves have heard
“such holy, and wise, and gracious discourses
“from his own mouth, that we are fully satisfied
“he is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the
“world.”

If any of the preceding remarks are judged to
carry truth and weight with them, the inserting
them in your Repository will gratify,

Gentlemen,
Your humble servant,

AUXILIATOR.

July 25, 1787.

*A Query concerning the Origin of the low
Arian Doctrine.*

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

I Sometimes amuse myself, and I think not unusefully, with tracing the rise and progress of particular opinions. For these things have their *causes* and *consequences*, as well as every thing else in the general system of nature, and therefore are proper subjects of philosophical inquiry.

Not being able to satisfy myself with respect to the origin of one particular opinion concerning the person of Christ, I wish to engage the assistance of your learned correspondents. It is that which in discourse is usually called *low Arianism*. For as the doctrine has never been the subject of any discussion, as it has had no existence till these late years, and the broacher of it is unknown, it is no wonder that it has got no specific name among writers.

Those who hold it say that Christ pre-existed, but not as the eternal logos of the Father, or as that great Being by whom he made the worlds, and had intercourse with the patriarchs, or as having had any certain rank, or employment, whatever, in the divine dispensations. They do not pretend to know what he was, or how he

was

was employed, before he came into the world; and therefore have nothing to say with respect to the propriety or expediency of his coming, and of his being the founder of the christian scheme. They are, indeed, unable to say whether he was any thing more than such an ordinary intelligent spirit, as being united to a human body constitutes *a man*. Consequently, they can give no reason why he should have pre-existed, any more than his apostles Peter, James, or John. They are equally silent when they are asked what was the date of his existence. They say he was prior to Abraham, but cannot tell whether he had ever seen Adam, or what advances he had made in knowledge, or virtue, prior to his coming into the world. Though I am not able to say *when*, or *by whom*, this kind of Arianism, as it is called, was advanced, I am confident it cannot have existed fifty years. Indeed I much question whether it can be proved, by any printed evidence, to have been known twenty years.

The ancient Arians held that Christ, though not the eternal logos of the Father, was the logos intended in the introduction to the gospel of John, that by him (a created, but superangelic Being) God made the whole visible creation. They also held that before this logos was united to the body of Jesus, he had been the medium of all the divine communications to man from the time of Adam. In short, they transferred all the offices of the *uncreated logos* of the platonizing christians, to their *created logos*;

278 *A Query concerning the Origin*

logos; their doctrine being evidently of later date than that.

This was the only species of Arianism that we can trace in all the early or middle ages. This too was the sentiment of Whiston, Emlyn, Peirce, and of all the distinguished Arians in this country half a century ago. Dr. Clarke was so far from thinking less highly of Christ, that he scrupled to call him *a creature*, holding him to have been coeternal with God himself, and a necessary agent in all the works of creation. Other Arians, however, have not chose to adopt his language or ideas, on the subject; thinking that his peculiar situation had led him to concede to the orthodox farther than he ought to have done.

It seems also that the doctrine of the creation of all things by a Being who was himself created, together with that of his having been the medium of all the divine communications with the human race, staggered many Arians; so that some (but this is of late years) have contented themselves with giving him the former province, but not the latter; thinking this to be inconsistent, not with his *nature* and *rank*, as the instrument of creation, but with the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews saying, that God had spoken to the Fathers *by the prophets*: but *in the last days* (that is as, in this connexion it must be understood, *only* in these last days, or the times of the gospel) by his Son.

One of your correspondents, MODERATUS, ascribes the creation of the *solar system* only to Christ;

Christ; and Dr. Price *this earth and its immediate connexions*, without defining what those connexions are; though, as there is no stricter connexion than between the earth and the sun, he must, I imagine, have meant to ascribe the creation of the sun to Christ; and if the sun, no doubt the solar system. They both also suppose that the matter out of which the system was made was first created out of nothing by the Father. These opinions however are, as far as appears, peculiar to these two writers.

Lastly, since the work of proper *creation* is always ascribed to God the Father, in the whole current of scripture, and there is another kind of creation spoken of both in the Old and New Testament, viz. a *restoration*, or *renovation* of things; many, it seems, have thought it more natural to ascribe such a creation as that of the sun, moon, and stars, to the Father, and the new creation, or renovation of things under the gospel to Christ. They content themselves, therefore, with ascribing to Christ *simple pre-existence*. But I have not found this modification of Arianism stated and defended against the high Arians, as they may now be called, on the one hand, and the Unitarians on the other, in any publication whatever. It is possible, however, that it may have been so stated and defended, though I am ignorant of it; and for this reason I request the assistance of your correspondents.

It will be said by the patrons of this opinion, that it is the doctrine of the New Testament, and therefore as old as the apostles. But this will only oblige me to change the form of my question,

question, and to ask at what time was this doctrine *supposed* to be that of the apostles; and who first pretended to find it in their writings? Certainly none of the ancients, learned or unlearned, and certainly also not Dr. Clarke, or any writer of his age. And surely it must be thought not a little extraordinary, that the true doctrine of the scriptures concerning Christ should not have been discovered till within the last fifty years, and be confined, as this notion probably is, within the island of Great-Britain.

I wish, however, to see this opinion distinctly stated, and fully discussed, as every other doctrine of consequence deserves to be, by the friends of it; and that they would shew why they suppose that what is said of the creation of all things by Christ should be merely figurative language, and yet should understand in the most literal sense all those passages in which they think his simple pre-existence is alluded to. To be determined by the authority of scripture with respect to the *pre-existence* of Christ only, and not with respect to any particular *rank* he enjoyed in that pre-existent state, they will not pretend; and the same writers, if they really meant to assert *either* of them, do, in the very same passages of their writings, and without any apparent difference in their style, assert *both*.

Nay, according to all the usual modes of interpretation, the work of *creation* is more expressly ascribed to Christ than *mere pre-existence*, in those passages in which no mention is made of creation. What can be stronger to this purpose than what John says of the *logos*, viz.

viz. that he *made all things*, and that *without him was not any thing made that was made*? What figure of speech can be suspected here? And yet the *low*, as well as the *high* Arians suppose that by the *logos* in this place is meant *Christ*.

In this I cannot help thinking they must find themselves very much embarrassed, and that if any person should seriously sit down to do this, so as to explain his scheme in a regular treatise, he would soon find it to be untenable. This I take to be the reason why this doctrine is not laid down in any printed treatise. I cannot help thinking it to be nothing more than the hasty opinion of those who are dissatisfied with the high Arian doctrine, on account of the extravagance of it (in supposing that a man, who lived four thousand years after Adam, who was born, who ate, drank, and slept, and who also died, like other men, was the creator of Adam and of all things) and yet having been long used to the idea of Christ's *pre-existence* cannot easily divest themselves of it. I therefore think that if these persons would give themselves time to reflect on the subject, so as to put down their thoughts in writing, they would find the scheme to vanish before a close examination, like a mist before the sun.

The gradual sinking of the magnificent system of Arianism to this low state seems to be a fulfilment of the prophecy of Dr. Lardner, that "the pride of Arianism would have a fall," though by *fall* he, no doubt, meant the utter extinction of it, of which its present condition

C c

may

may be considered as a symptom. Compared with what Arianism has been, what we now hear of it is but a faint *echo*; and growing fainter and fainter, I will venture to predict, it will soon be heard no more.

However, I really write for information on the subject; and therefore once more request your correspondents to inform me whether there be extant any treatise, in which the low Arian hypothesis I have described be distinctly *stated and defended*, or indeed whether it has been so much as *avowed* by any writer whatever.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your very humble Servant,

JOSEPHUS.

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

THE essay of your judicious correspondent Philostor is, in my opinion, admirably calculated to convince X. Y. Z. and every other Arian, that the love, which we owe to Christ, is never inculcated from the consideration of his having left a prior state of glory and happiness to come into this world, but solely from the consideration of what he did and suffered on earth.

Before

Before I had seen this truly valuable essay, I had thrown together a few observations, occasioned by the paper of X. Y. Z. with the view of showing: First, That the Unitarian idea of the person of Christ ought not to be rejected, because it may be difficult to reconcile it with a pre-conceived opinion of the nature and degree of the love due to him from christians, if that idea be found to be the only one, which can be made to accord with the conclusions of unbiassed reason, and the general current of the plain scriptural language relating to that subject; and secondly, That the love, which we really owe to Christ, may be more powerfully enforced, and is likely to become more elevated and intense, on unitarian than on Arian principles. If my observations be thought sufficiently distinct from the more important ones of Philosopher, and also worthy of being laid before X. Y. Z. and others, whom he represents as entangled in the same difficulties as himself, you are permitted to bring them forward to their attention through the channel of your Repository by,

Gentlemen,

Your humble servant,

A D J U T O R.

FOR the sake of greater perspicuity, and in order to enable my readers to see at once, whether *any* part, or how much of my reasoning will stand unshaken, should any one think fit to attack it, I shall arrange my observations in a series of numbered paragraphs.

C c 2

1. The

1. The manner, in which the mind of a person is affected by an hypothesis, cannot be of itself a distinct proof of its truth; for then contrary hypotheses might so far have an equal claim to that character, different persons declaring themselves, in some cases, to be affected in the same manner by opinions directly the reverse of each other. Therefore,

2. The prejudice, which one person may feel in favour of a particular hypothesis, arising from the manner in which it affects his mind, when another person may be equally prejudiced in favour of the opposite hypothesis by the like circumstance, ought not to be allowed any influence in determining the judgment about it, being the same as a positive quantity in a calculation, set against a negative one of equal value, by which its effect is totally destroyed.

3. If such prejudice ought not to determine the judgment *at first*, when different hypotheses are brought under examination, for the reason just assigned; neither, for the same reason, should it be allowed to have influence enough either to prevent farther inquiry, or to *fix* a person in an opinion once adopted, if, upon re-consideration, it should appear to be not well founded.

4. Ideas formed on a particular hypothesis concerning the nature or extent of a duty, having no support independent of the grounds of that hypothesis, ought to be no bar to the reception of a different hypothesis, if this latter be found to enjoy superior evidence of its truth, and be also incapable of being held in conjunction with the former. From hence it follows,

5. That,

5. That, as far as the ideas of any duty are drawn from a particular hypothesis, they ought to be given up as wrong, when the hypothesis itself is discovered to be false.

6. If those ideas be drawn from language, which the persons, who prescribe the duty with competent authority, have used in their descriptions of it, and be inconsistent with the only hypothesis, that can be reconciled with the plain and unequivocal language, employed by the same persons in speaking of the subject to which that hypothesis relates; the conclusion must be, that the former and not the latter language is, some way or other, misunderstood. The force of that language, which (without torture, or without imputing mental reservation and duplicity to persons, on whose characters there is no ground for fixing such imputation) will admit of one construction only, must remain; and all other language, which may *seem* to lead to different ideas, ought to be interpreted in some sense consistent with it. Persons, who understood what they wrote and were honest, could not use two sorts of language in one and the same small work equally clear, and at the same time contradictory to each other. The *clear* language, therefore, of such persons, which cannot be misunderstood, ought to be the guide in interpreting any other found in their writings. And consequently, if an hypothesis be founded on their *clear* language, to which *one meaning only* can be affixed, the notion of a duty, derived from *other* language used by them, ought to be made to conform to that hypothesis.

7. If X. Y. Z. should have nothing to object to the foregoing positions, he will be forced to allow: First, that the manner, in which his mind is affected by the hypothesis he hath embraced concerning the person of Christ, and the prejudice he may have thence conceived in favour of it, are not proofs of its truth; and ought not to have had any influence in determining him at first to adopt, or in making him still retain it, if he then found, or now find, a different one to be supported by stronger arguments; and, secondly, That the ideas he entertains of love to Christ, ought to be such as may be reconciled with the hypothesis, which, in his impartial judgment, appears to have the clearest and most convincing evidence on its side. Therefore,

8. Though I should fail in my attempt to prove, that love to Christ is best founded and rises highest on unitarian principles, he will not be able to refuse his assent to the truth of those principles, if he find reason and scripture to furnish more cogent and conclusive arguments in favour of them, than of any others. I now proceed to make the attempt.

9. In estimating the affection of a friend, as far as it is discoverable from any services which he hath done us, and the love which we owe him in return, we take into consideration the motives, by which he appeared to have been actuated, with respect both to their nature and degree—the value of the services rendered—and the trouble, expence, or suffering, occasioned by the performance of them,

10. As to one of the motives, by which Christ was prompted to serve mankind, and which peculiarly calls for their love, every christian will agree, that it was benevolence, and that the manner in which this benevolence was expressed, proved it to be the strongest that any one could discover, according to his own observation; *Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends*.*

* Is it likely, that, if Jesus had been conscious of having enjoyed exalted dignity and happiness in a prior state, by relinquishing which to undergo labour, hardships, and various acute sufferings in this for the benefit of mankind, he had already shown his concern to promote their welfare, he would not only have neglected to mention *directly*, but also in the most distant manner to *allude* to, this circumstance, and have insisted on that *only* of laying down his life for them? Was not the circumstance of his having resigned for a season his former glory and bliss, in order to become the instrument of human salvation, of sufficient magnitude and consequence to suggest itself to his recollection, upon this or any other similar occasion? or could it be in his judgment of so trifling importance, compared with that of his undergoing death, as not to deserve to be so much as ever hinted at, when he was speaking of his love to mankind? Or, once more, if he could be supposed to make so little account of it himself (which, however, had it really taken place, it would be impossible to suppose) could his disciples fairly lay the principal stress upon it, as the *highest* mark of his love? Fown, and I think it will by and by appear, that, by supposing Christ to have pre-existed, we considerably lessen the force of the evidence, which he gave of his love to mankind by any thing he did or suffered; but the proof of that love, arising from the circumstance of his submitting to death, seems to be weakened, as well as the proof of it arising from any thing else which took place with respect to him: so that I do not see, how we are to account for his urging the circumstance of his laying down his life as a proof of his love, and of his never mentioning with the same view that of his having left the joys of heaven, had he been conscious of having enjoyed them before he appeared in this world. And this omission must, I think, appear exceedingly strange to those, who with X. Y. Z. seem

11. As to the services, which Christ rendered the world, these the unitarian considers in much the same light as christians of any other description, except those, who look upon him as having actually borne the sufferings due to their sins, and thereby satisfied divine justice.

12. As to the trouble, expence, and suffering, which it cost our Lord to serve mankind, I think, that *they* must appear to have been greater on unitarian than on Arian principles, and that of course we must feel a higher degree of love to him on the former than on the latter. It doth not seem easy to conceive, that the circumstance of a mere temporary degradation from an exalted rank to effect the everlasting salvation of a large number of rational creatures, if not accompanied with *positive suffering*, would be very irksome to a being, who was disposed to become a pattern of humility, felt the warmest and most enlarged benevolence, would enjoy during his degradation a remembrance of his former greatness and felicity, knew himself to be a peculiar object of the divine favour, and was to have always before him a certain prospect of being soon exalted again to the same station he had quitted, or a higher. And surely all this will be allowed to have been the case with respect to Christ on Arian principles. But the Arian will probably say, that, though a degradation, *not* accompanied with *positive suffering*, might not be exceedingly

to found the claim of Christ to extraordinary gratitude and love *chiefly*, on his having emptied himself and become incarnate.

painful

painful, yet a degradation from a state of very exalted felicity to one of *great labour* and *pain* must, from the very contrast, be attended with far greater suffering than any, that a mere man in the latter of those states could possibly feel.

This position doth not strike me at present to be well founded, but its contrary. I presume, that no one will insist, that there was any thing so peculiar in the materials or structure of our Lord's body, as to render it susceptible of greater suffering from outward violence than *any* other human body *whatever*; for of this I am not aware that any evidence can be produced from facts. And, if there be no ground for making this supposition, the painful sensations produced by injuries done to his body were the same on any scheme, considered *abstractedly and by themselves*. The only thing, therefore, to be examined is, whether his sufferings arising from such injuries (which we now suppose him to have been *capable* of feeling in an equal degree on any scheme, *as far as his body only was concerned*), were likely to be rendered greater or less, by the influence of his mind on his body, on the Arian than the unitarian scheme. And this question seems to admit of an easy decision. We read of many, who, supported by a good conscience and a strong faith, have at certain seasons looked forward to the most painful deaths from the hand of violence with much composure, and met them with serenity and even joy. The treatment which some of these persons received, was, no doubt, such as was adapted to produce most exquisite tortures of body; but a conscious-

ness

ness of integrity, and the glorious prospects of faith enabled them to bear them with that magnanimity and firmness, which they displayed. Now these persons are allowed to have been *mere men*, who had existed but a few years, and had not before experienced such happiness as they expected, but founded their hope of it on assurances given to persons of their character by Christ and his apostles. Our Lord, on the pre-existent scheme, was a being originally far superior to man, had enjoyed before his incarnation very extraordinary measures of knowledge and power, and experienced from eternity, or for no one knows how many ages, a very high degree of felicity. The comprehension of his mind must, therefore, have been vastly beyond our conception, and his knowledge of the extent and value of heavenly happiness clear and certain.

If, then, mere men, who cannot be proved to have originally enjoyed powers superior to those of many other persons, and whose comprehension of mind, acquired in the course of a few years, must have been, *comparatively* speaking, very small; could, by the aids of faith and a good conscience, so far abstract their attention from their corporal sufferings, as to go through them with plain marks of cheerfulness and even exultation; it is a most natural inference, that the workings and views of our Lord's mind (through that vigour and comprehension surpassing probably the reach of our ideas, which on the pre-existent scheme it must be supposed to have enjoyed) would have abstracted his attention much *more* from his corporal sufferings, if they had not
entirely

entirely withdrawn it. The same inference may be deduced from the following words of the apostle Paul, Rom. viii. 18. *I reckon, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory, which shall be revealed in us.* For if he, who had not before enjoyed that glory, but only beheld it at a distance by an eye of faith, could set so lightly by the dreadful sufferings, to which he was exposed, or, which is much the same, rise so entirely above them, when compared with the great objects of his christian hope; how much more diminutive must the like sufferings have appeared to one, who had known by experience the value of celestial glory and happiness, was infallibly sure of soon enjoying them again for ever, if possible, augmented, and by the vast comprehension and energy of his mind could take in, and *bold under his steady contemplation*, the past and future scenes of his exalted dignity and bliss? Now if this inference be fairly drawn, and sufferings (as cannot be denied) be felt only in proportion to the attention paid to them, how much, on the Arian scheme, must those of our Lord have been lessened? And as these sufferings are allowed on all hands to prove, among other things, his benevolence to man, and, by being expressive of that benevolence, to be one principal ground of our love to him; how much less forcibly do they strike us in these views on the Arian than unitarian hypothesis? It is true, that on the former hypothesis great dignity, splendour, and enjoyment, as far as this last depended on *external* circumstances, were resigned by our Lord.

But

But then it should also be remembered, that the happiness, arising from the consciousness of perfect rectitude of temper and conduct, from the possession and exercise of very sublime and enlarged powers of mind, and from comprehensive and distinct views of his own past and future glory, and of that to which he was to be the instrument of raising his followers, was *retained* by him. And having in his incarnate state that kind of happiness, the most noble and refined, according to the general apprehensions of all wise and good people, that an intelligent nature can any where enjoy, he may be considered as having brought with him to this world, and experienced during his stay in it, a very large and important part of the felicity he had felt in heaven. His sufferings, therefore, which sacred history doth not represent as peculiar before the commencement of his public ministry, might still, for aught I see to the contrary, have admitted of all the alleviation, before mentioned, from the extraordinary powers, comprehension, and workings of his mind. And, if this be granted, it deserves consideration, whether the consequences deduced above do not remain unshaken. On unitarian principles his sufferings wear a very different aspect. For,

13. On those principles they were the sufferings of a man like ourselves, and in this view of them cannot fail to excite high admiration of his faith and trust in God and benevolence to mankind. The account we have of the humble condition of his parents, with whom he seems to have spent the first twenty-nine or thirty years of

of his life, doth not afford any reason for supposing, that his mind received any *peculiar* enlargement from the education he enjoyed. They probably gave him the best instructions they were able, and set before him good examples; and under the influence of those, without the aids of learning, of which he is said to have been destitute, he might acquire a very meek, humble, benevolent, pious, and devout frame of mind by the time that he was called to assume a public character. But when we consider, that, with this preparation only, and the supernatural light communicated to him by God to qualify him for his office, he stepped forth into life at a period when temptations of various kinds assault with great violence, we must feel ourselves constrained to own, that what he did and suffered raises his character above that of any one among his followers, and gives him an indisputable claim to a much larger share of love, gratitude, and respect from us, than we can owe to any other man.

Regarding him as nothing more than a human being, what reverence, affection, and esteem must we feel excited in our minds by his condescension to the weakness and ignorance of his disciples, his patience and meekness under the variety of cruel treatment he received from his enemies, his guarded conduct to avoid giving offence, his unremitted labour in performing the work of his divine mission, his entire mortification to the pleasures and grandeurs of the world, the habitual devotion of his mind, conspicuous on all occasions, his constant readiness to inform the honest inquirer, his exquisitely
tender

tender sympathy for the afflicted, his kind attention to the sorrows of genuine penitence which he prevented from sinking into despondence by the cheering assurances of its efficacy to obtain pardon; the pity he felt and expressed for his devoted nation both on his approach to Jerusalem and on his way to Calvary, and, to crown all, his resignation in drinking the cup of the most ignominious and painful death in obedience to the will of his heavenly Father, and to give the last and strongest proof of his love to mankind!

This conduct, it should be observed as just now hinted, was that of a *young* man in the full vigour of life, when we see, that in *others* pride, ambition, and a love of pleasure are most difficult to be restrained—of a young man exposed to some temptations *peculiar* to himself, arising from the apprehensions entertained by his countrymen of the nature and design of his rank and office as Messiah—of a young man encompassed with followers, whose prejudices and stupidity baffled all the means employed by him in his life time to cure them, and by whom he foresaw that he should be betrayed and deserted, when expressions of their affection and attachment would be most acceptable and consolatory—of a young man constantly annoyed by the attacks of crafty and inveterate enemies, whose malice, he knew, would be appeased with nothing short of his blood—of a young man, who in these most trying circumstances could derive no assistance from those who were around him, but single and unsupported himself was obliged to be continually attending
to

to his own feelings, to the ignorance, prejudices, and timidity of his disciples, and to the subtlety and malice of his foes. When we survey our Lord's conduct in this light, he must rise in our estimation far above other men in excellence of character, and be acknowledged to have displayed unequalled strength of faith, piety, and benevolence.

Accordingly the unitarian, whenever he attentively reviews the several parts of our Lord's character thus exhibited, and particularly the active, steady, and inextinguishable benevolence, which constituted one leading feature of it, must, I think, perceive far greater veneration, love, and gratitude excited in his mind for *him* than for any *other* man, and greater than the Arian would be likely to feel upon a similar review, if he reflected at the time, that on his principles it was the conduct of a *superangelic being*, which *he* was contemplating, whose original and acquired powers, intellectual and moral, may be naturally supposed (agreeably to the foregoing reasoning) to have rendered him in a manner, if not altogether, insensible to the force of those applications to his feelings, which to one no more than man would have proved the most severe and painful trials.

I suspect, that what hath induced some to speak rather slightly of the sufferings of Christ, as if, considered as the sufferings of a mere man, they were not more important than those of other martyrs in the same cause, and afforded no proof that he was superior to them in excellence of character, is their overlooking what was *peculiar* in his circumstances. The sufferings and death
of

of Christ were those of the *introducer* of a new religion. In this light they were of the highest consequence, as they gave the most convincing proof of his sincerity, of his entire resignation to the appointments of heaven, of his immovable faith in the divine promises, and of his solicitude to raise his followers above all the allurements and terrors of the world by the influence of his example, and thus encourage them to persevere even unto death in a course of conduct, which would secure their everlasting felicity. If some of his followers flew from sufferings and death, their conduct in so doing, would not prove the falsehood of their religion, or the inefficacy of its principles and motives *in themselves considered*, especially while others among them, supported by those principles and motives, were ready to endure and actually endured, the worst consequences of a steady attachment to christianity. But had Christ, the *author* of this religion shunned any sufferings, to which the publication of it could have subjected him, an essential proof would have been wanting, that he was himself convinced of the truth of his own declarations, and of the certainty of those future retributions, which he had been leading others to expect. In this case also there could have been no reasonable ground to suppose, that any of his followers would submit to any great inconveniencies, much less to death, in defence of his cause. His sufferings, therefore, were far more important than those of any subsequent martyr, the reception and success of his religion and the allegiance of any of his followers to him, absolutely

absolutely depending on the circumstance of his leading the way in bearing as much or more than they might be called to suffer. His death in particular is also of greater consequence than that of any other martyr in this view—, that without dying he could not have risen from the dead; and had he not given in his own person an instance of the reviviscence of a human being after death, who was to die no more, some doubts might have been entertained about the reality of those future recompences of virtue, which he had promised to the good; and the grand fact, from which the truth of his religion derives one of its most powerful evidences, and which alone seems capable of affording adequate support to the fortitude of christians in some circumstances, would not have taken place. As to the manner in which his sufferings displayed an excellence of character *superior* to that of any one among his followers, it hath been already illustrated. Your judicious correspondent Pamphilus observes, that *the dignity and elevation of our Lord's mind, no doubt, exceeded that of any other man*, vol. vi. p. 310; and that, considering the dread and horror of his mind at the view of his approaching sufferings, *the degree of resignation and fortitude, which he manifested, far exceeds any thing that we read of in history*. Ibid. p. 318.

14. It is almost superfluous to observe, that the same circumstances, to which, if we may be allowed to reason concerning their operation and influence from analogy, we seem directly led to ascribe a power sufficient to lessen in a

VOL. VI,

D d

very

very great degree, if not annihilate, the sufferings of our Lord on earth, would probably have operated in like manner in diminishing or preventing any pain from the *prospect* of them in his pre-existent state. Indeed, if this be not allowed, will it not follow, that his happiness (he being acquainted with the divine purpose of sending him to this earth) would have had some alloy even in heaven? This consequence, at which my mind, and that, I imagine, of every other christian revolts with horror, seems, however, to be unavoidable without supposing, that our Lord was capable of preventing the prospect of his sufferings on earth from giving him any uneasiness*. Before I conclude this paragraph I desire X. Y. Z. and every other reader *carefully* to observe, that my sole aim hath been to show, that upon principles, which at present seem to me just, but which I hold myself bound to give up as soon as they are proved to be otherwise, the sufferings of Christ upon the unitarian were *greater*, and being in that view *a more expensive proof* of his benevolence, are adapted to excite warmer love and gratitude to him, than on the Arian scheme; and that it hath been the farthest possible from my intention or wishes to lessen, in the *smallest degree*, the affec-

* If it be granted, that our Lord, by the exertion of any powers he enjoyed, could keep his mind totally free from uneasiness under the *prospect* of the sufferings, which he was to undergo, is it improbable (those powers being retained with the capacity of exerting them on earth) that he could render the actual *endurance* of them far less painful than it would have been to any other man, though the best that had ever existed?

tion

tion and esteem, which the Arian feels for our blessed Saviour. Indeed I do not see, how the love of X. Y. Z. or of any other Arian to Christ can be any way affected by my arguments, if he judge them *inconclusive*; or, on the other hand, if they strike him as *conclusive*, how it should not be *heightened*; if he finally "settle his opinion in favour of the unitarian principles." I also desire, that it may be noticed with equal attention, that, how well satisfied soever I may be myself of the truth of unitarian principles, I have written on the supposition of its being yet a subject of discussion, and on that supposition proposed what had often occurred to my mind relating to the manner, in which unitarian and Arian principles seem to affect our notions of the sufferings of Christ, to show that the former are not liable to the objection of being unfavourable to the love, which we owe him, but the contrary. This X. Y. Z. wanted to see done. At the same time I am fully persuaded, and most readily own, that, if we should find hereafter that Christ was an exalted pre-existent spirit, we shall see, that no being merely human, even with such information and miraculous powers as Christ enjoyed, was fit to answer all the purposes of a Saviour to mankind, how strong soever may be our present conviction, that Christ was nothing more than man, and yet was fully qualified to answer all the purposes of a Saviour mentioned in the scriptures.

15. X. Y. Z. in the second paragraph of his paper, founds the love and reverence we owe to Christ on the part he acted when on earth; in

D d 2

the

the third paragraph on the solicitude he felt before he assumed a body to approve himself to God and do the most benevolent offices to men; and in p. 102, 103. on the character, which he sustained and the works which he wrought, &c. &c. &c. whilst here on earth; in which last passage I suppose he unites the two former grounds of love. It is self-evident, that the ground of love to Christ, mentioned in the third paragraph, can be none to an unitarian, as he denies his pre-existence. As to the ground of it, mentioned in the second paragraph, it hath been my aim to show, that it is wider and firmer on unitarian than on Arian principles: whether I have failed or not, I cheerfully leave every reader to determine for himself.

16. Our author seems to think (see p. 101) that "from the circumstance of Jesus Christ "having been *assuaged, directed,* and so far "strengthened by the spirit of God, our gratitude "for any benefits we have received through him "appears, on unitarian principles, to be rather "due to God than to him." No doubt the highest degree of it must be due to God; but what reason can there be, why it should not also be extended to Christ, though he did not pre-exist? Is not the conduct of Christ in what he *did and suffered on earth* as much, on unitarian principles, the effect of voluntary choice, produced by pious and benevolent motives, as his conduct, on other principles, in *assuming a body* to serve mankind? If his being *assuaged and directed* by the spirit of God diminish his right to our gratitude for his *kind services on earth*, will
not

not his enjoying such amazing degrees of wisdom and power, as must be ascribed to him on the lowest Arian hypothesis, have the same effect, in at least an equal degree, with respect to his claim to our gratitude, *on account of his submitting to become incarnate?* Is there any more reason for supposing, that he acted from compulsion in what he *did on earth*, if he were a man only, than that he acted from a like compulsion, if he pre-existed, *in leaving his former glory?* If there be not, would it not be arbitrary to suppose, that he *might* have refused to assume a body, but *could not* have avoided acting as he did on earth as nothing more than man, even had he so pleased?

Our Lord frequently uses expressions, which show the conduct he pursued on earth, as one of the human race, to have been as much the effect of a voluntary choice, as his submitting to a temporary degradation could be on the pre-existent scheme. Our author seems to understand, by the Spirit being poured out on Christ without measure, his being favoured with what are called the *moral* influences of the Spirit in an unlimited degree. Allowing him for a moment to be right in that opinion, I ask, must there not be still less reason for supposing, “that
“ our Saviour had it in his power to act, in any
“ respect, so as in the least degree to have de-
“ feated the purposes of that infinite wisdom,
“ by which he was continually directed,” if,
besides the extraordinary communications he enjoyed, he brought with him from heaven the wisdom and power of an exalted pre-existent Spirit, than if, in connexion with those com-

munications, he had *no more* than the faculties and knowledge of a man? But I humbly conceive, that our author mistakes the sense of the passage he alludes to. When our Saviour is said to have had the spirit without measure, it appears to me highly probable, that nothing more is meant, than that he enjoyed in the compleatest manner, all the knowledge and power, which were requisite to qualify him for instructing mankind in the religion he was to teach them, and to prove its divine original. Is it not evident, that, by supposing the words to relate to moral influences, which being *without measure* would have given him a superiority to every difficulty and trial, we render the distress of his mind on some occasions, when he was looking forward to the painful baptism with which he was to be baptized, unaccountable, and the appearance of an angel to strengthen him in the garden an unnecessary and superfluous miracle?

17. Our author thinks, "that as these powers (viz. those with which Christ was invested) were given and continued to him by the Father, for the specific purposes of his mission, and as he acknowledged that it was *the Father who worked in him*, it cannot be on any good grounds supposed, that the same divine energy would have attended Christ on the supposition of its having been possible for him to have attempted the application of it to purposes directly opposite to those for which it was bestowed." Does he think, that, if Christ had come into the world with such powers, and it *had been* in that case morally possible for him

him to attempt, by the exercise of them, to effect purposes directly opposite to those of his heavenly Father, he would have been permitted to do so? If not, how is the disposition of our Lord's mind more conspicuous from his actually employing them in the manner, which tended to accomplish the designs of God, on the Arian than the unitarian hypothesis? The circumstance of their having been *inherent* in his nature, or *bestowed on him* thousands of years before his incarnation on the former hypothesis, and only communicated to him considered as *nothing more than man*, to answer the specific purposes of his mission, makes no difference as to the inference to be drawn from the *real* application of them with regard to his *temper*, if on *both* they be allowed to have been subject to the controul of a superior being.

18. Having now offered some thoughts on the paper of X. Y. Z. whose modesty, piety, and candour deserve high commendation, I take my leave of him with proposing to his attentive consideration the following remarks. The lowest Arian scheme, that I have ever seen, ascribes the creation of our solar system, or of this earth at least, with all its primitive furniture of animals and vegetables, to Christ. Must not Christ, then, be allowed to have originally enjoyed power, equal to the performance of any miracle, which he wrought on earth? Was he *divested* of this power upon becoming incarnate, or *not*? If he *were*, is there not something very hard to be accounted for in such an event, when we find it to have been necessary, that upon entering on his public ministry he should be

D d 4

invested

invested with a similar power (such as could in a moment produce new limbs, give life to the dead, and controul the elements of nature) that he might be able to do the various mighty works, which were to be shown forth in him? Was he not only divested of that power, but also of his *recollection* of having ever *enjoyed* such? Then it should seem, that he must have also forgotten the *whole* of his prior existence: and upon this supposition it may be asked, how shall we account for such a being having been employed instead of a man, when we cannot perceive, that he enjoyed any advantage over a man by any thing that he could say from his own past knowledge and experience? Besides, all the proof, which Arians imagine they derive of Christ's having been conscious of a prior existence from the passages, in which he speaks of *his coming out from God, or down from heaven*, of which he could know nothing but by particular revelation, is lost, and they must feel themselves obliged to have recourse to other interpretations of such phrases than those, which they have hitherto adopted, to convert them to their purpose. If he were *not* divested of that power, what need had he of the communications, of which the scriptures plainly speak, and to the efficiency of which he himself expressly ascribes the mighty works he performed? Did he want more power to still the sea, restore limbs to the maimed, or raise the dead, than to create this world, and to give life and motion to matter in producing man and all the various kinds of animals, with which it was at first stocked? Let an Arian make which of these two suppositions he

he pleasts, and try whether he can give answers to the questions just raised from them, which will be satisfactory to his mind.

P. S. Upon closing the preceding paper it occurred to be, that some, notwithstanding all there advanced, might still think, that a comparison, frequently made by Arians to show that christians must feel much warmer love and gratitude to Christ on their scheme than on the unitarian, is a just one, and sufficient for their purpose. The comparison is between the condescension of Christ and that of a prince, who should stoop to the lowest offices and greatest inconveniences to promote the welfare of the subjects of the king his father. Would not those subjects, it is asked, feel, that they owed much more love to the prince, than they would to any one among themselves, who, capable of rendering them an equal service, had actually done it? I grant it; but I must beg leave to dispute the propriety of the comparison. The prince, being of the same class of creatures as the subject, and, therefore, naturally capable of an equal degree of suffering from want, labour, reproach, insult, and bodily pain, without necessarily having any thing peculiar in his constitution or circumstances to inspire him with greater fortitude, than the subject might require, or to render him less susceptible of suffering, would make a greater sacrifice by leaving a situation attended with greater ease, convenience, and enjoyment, with which, therefore, a situation attended with trouble, toil, and pain, would form a more affecting contrast, Christ, on the
Arian

Arian scheme, was a being of an order far superior to the human, was originally possessed of much greater comprehension and vigour of mind, and was furnished, by his own past experience of celestial happiness, and infallible certainty of soon entering upon it again, with far more powerful supports than a mere man. If, therefore, the reasoning of the above paper be just, he had within him the means of blunting in a great measure, if not of taking off altogether, the poignancy of bodily sufferings, which a mere man could not have. Thus the two cases are by no means parallel, and the comparison will not hold.

I trust that Idiota will not be offended at my mentioning, that there is a very ingenious pamphlet just published by Mr. N. Nisbett, entitled, *An Attempt to illustrate various important Passages in the New Testament*, in which the supposition of our Lord's referring to the destruction of Jerusalem only in Matt. xxiv. is very ably defended. Mr. Nisbett refers to the Bishop of Waterford's observations on our Lord's character as a divine instructor for an illustration of the manner, in which the signs, spoken of in that chapter, were fulfilled. If Idiota will give us his remarks on what those judicious writers have advanced on this subject, he will oblige myself and perhaps many other readers of the Repository.

I shall

I shall be glad to see at the same time, how he reconciles the supposition, that the virtuous disciples of Christ will be raised at the commencement of the millenium, with those passages of scripture, which speak of one resurrection only, when both the good and bad are to be raised and judged. The difficulty also attending his scheme, from the circumstance of a vast multitude, being represented as making an attack on the saints at the end of the thousand years, may deserve his attention. This difficulty I had drawn out at full length on the supposition, that some record or tradition of what had happened at the beginning of the millenium might be preserved among the people; who will compose that multitude; or that, if they should have no such record or tradition, it would seem unlikely, that the perfect safety of the saints should not be known to them by some means or other, so as to render any attempt to destroy them improbable. It is enough just to suggest the difficulty. I shall rejoice to see it removed, and the doctrine of the resurrection of the virtuous disciples of Christ at the opening of the millenary state established. This doctrine will bring the prospect of happiness much nearer to those, who think the dead will remain insensible till the resurrection.

Adjutor begs leave to add to the paper, signed *A Lover of Order*, that, besides the alteration he proposes, there might be a propriety in recommending ministers afresh to the blessing of heaven every time they change their situations, a practice, which, I believe, is fallen into total desuetude

desuetude among protestant dissenters. That author indeed takes notice of this circumstance in the beginning of his paper (to which I wish attention may be paid by the persons whom it concerns) but does not afterwards recommend the imitation of the conduct observed with respect to Paul and Barnabas.

To the DIRECTORS *of the* THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

IT has often been insinuated by unbelievers in revelation, that the institutions of Moses rest on no better foundation than those of the people of Indostan, that every thing of this remote antiquity is equally involved in obscurity, and that it may be taken for granted, without any particular examination, that they are either the contrivances of the wise, or the fancies of the foolish, but are not intitled to the consideration of men of sense in this more enlightened age. But they who talk or write, in this loose manner, have not, I am persuaded, given due attention either to the nature of historical evidence, or to the remarkable difference between the circumstances of the institutions of Moses and those in the religion of the Hindoos, or of any other that have been opposed to them. Several
of

of these circumstances are enumerated in Dr. Priestley's late *Letters to Philosophical Unbelievers*, Part II.

Willing, however, to get what farther satisfaction I could on this subject, and not contenting myself with carefully attending to every thing I could find in *print* relating to it, I drew up a set of *queries*, which are sent to the most intelligent of our countrymen now residing in Indostan; and, as it must be a considerable time before any answer can come from so great a distance, I also submitted them to a gentleman of learning and character, who has resided much in the East, and who is, in all respects, as well qualified to give a satisfactory answer to them as any person now in Europe. These *answers*, together with the *queries* themselves, I, with his leave, submit to your disposal, without making any remarks on the nature and tendency of them, as to your intelligent readers, such remarks will be unnecessary.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your's, &c.

SCRUTATOR.

London, 8th November, 1787.

DEAR SIR,

THE length of time that has intervened since you favoured me with your *Queries* respecting the religion of Hindostan, may well have induced you to think me inattentive to your request. The truth is, that whilst I was engaged in a pretty extensive course of reading
on

on the subject, I was rather suddenly called to —, where I have been for some months past; and from whence I am but just returned.

I cannot say that I have been much enlightened by my studies. Amidst a number of fine moral truths, and many deep metaphysical speculations, you meet with a thousand absurdities and contradictions. Their mythology is inexplicably confused. Much of it is doubtless allegorical, and some part, probably, historical, but in general I cannot help thinking it mere nonsense, devised by idle priests, to amuse and astonish an ignorant multitude. These monstrous inventions being grafted on the historical and allegorical writings of their predecessors, have served to obscure and debase them, and they are now scarcely distinguishable in the mass. But I shall endeavour, as far as I am able, to give some sort of answer to your queries, in their order.

- 1st. "Do the four sacred books, called *Vedas*,
 "contain any historical account of miracles
 "wrought in proof of the divine mission
 "of the writers of them, or of the person
 "who first taught the doctrine contained
 "in them?"

It seems to be very doubtful whether any copies of the *Vêds* exist. No European of credit ever pretended to have read them. Translations of some detached fragments have been given by Halhed, Dow, and others; but what we, and the Hindoos themselves, know of them, is through the medium of the various shasters or commentaries, written at different periods by learned

learned Brahmans. The subjects of them, as collected from these authorities, appear to be, not historical, but dogmatical; unless we except their fanciful account of the creation of the world and of man, in which the writers do not very well agree amongst themselves. The original Vêds were supposed to have been delivered by the hand of God to the first created being; but it seems to be admitted that those were lost, and that the books of that name, presumed now to exist, were compiled by a man of the name of Veiâs, who lived at the commencement of the present age of the world, or near five thousand years ago. This period, you well know, is very vague, and I have in vain tried to find internal evidence of such antiquity, in those writings of Veiâs of which we have translations.

I must, however, remark, that a very accurate and ingenious French astronomer gives the Hindoos great credit for the extent and precision of their ancient astronomical calculations, which he endeavours to prove superior to those of the Chaldeans or Chinese. To answer this query more in point, I shall say, that I believe the Vêds do not contain any historical accounts of miracles wrought in proof of a divine mission.

2d. "Is there any history of the writers of those books, and of the circumstances in which they were written?"

None such appears to have come to our knowledge, and I have reason to think that none which can be depended upon, exists. The dates quoted in the preface to the Gentoo code of

of some ancient writings, of the first and third ages, are too outré to merit attention.

- 3d. "Is there any written history of the Hindoo nation, connecting the period in which those books were written, with that of the conquest of the country by the Tartars? If not, is there any account of the succession of kings, or generations of men, or data of any other kind, by which we may be able to ascertain the length of that interval?"

No history of this kind is mentioned by any good authority. That spoken of by Mr. Halhed is of the three earlier yagues or ages. In the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions* there is an account of a MS. in the king of France's library (frequently quoted in *L'Examen Véridique*, which probably you may have seen) containing a chronological table of reigns (given in the *Mémoire*) but it bears no mark of fidelity or even of possibility. There are the races of the sun, and the races of the moon, and similar extravagances, but nothing that connects their ancient history with the period of the Tartar invasion.

- 4th. "Is the language in which the sacred books are written radically different from that which is commonly spoken in Indostan, or is the latter only a dialect of the other, or a gradual deviation from it? If it be radically different from the common language of the country, what is become of the people who spoke it?"

I am

I am at present firmly of opinion that the languages are radically the same; that the Sanskrit, or language of the sacred writings, was the general one of India, but that being fixed by those writings, so sedulously preserved, it must of course in these days appear to differ materially from the current language of the country, which must have altered considerably by the mere lapse of time, independent of the political revolutions the country has suffered, and the consequent influx of foreign terms. I am also convinced that the obscurity of the Sanskrit arises as much from the abstract nature of the subjects usually treated of, and the abundance of metaphysical terms with which the writings are filled (many of them probably coined or compounded for the occasion) as from the causes just mentioned. My opinion, however, of the similarity, is founded on comparison.

5th. "Is the religion taught in the four Vedas different from that of the popular superstitions, and if so, which is the more ancient?"

6th. "If the popular superstitions be prior to the writing of these books, do they give their sanction to them? Or do the learned despise the popular superstitions, at the same time that they conform to them, as the Grecian philosophers did with respect to the popular religion of their times?"

I have found no reason to think that the popular superstitions differ much from those exhibited in the commentaries on the Vêds. It

is impossible that they can be more extravagantly absurd. There is a wonderful mixture of refined sense and gross nonsense in their most celebrated religious treatises. The same philosophers who have evidently discovered and maintained the subtle doctrine advanced by the bishop of Cloyne, respecting the existence of qualities as sensations of the mind, independent of a material substratum, appear to believe, and to be enamoured with, the tale of churning the ocean, by means of a serpent coiled round a mountain, in order to procure immortal butter. But my very ingenious friend Mr. Wilkins (who has just published a translation from the original Sanskrit, of the fables we call Pilpay's) says, in his preface to the Bhagvat Greta, that "the most learned Brahmans of the present times are unitarians, according to the doctrine of Kreeshtna; but at the same time that they believe but in one God, an universal spirit, they so far comply with the prejudices of the vulgar, as outwardly to perform all the ceremonies inculcated by the Vêds, such as sacrifices, ablutions, &c."

You will have the goodness to receive these answers from me with grains of allowance. My acquaintance with the Hindoos, and their language, is very superficial, and I cannot say how far, upon further progress, I may be led to alter my opinions. I doubt if I have conveyed to you one word of new information, but I am happy to shew, even by the attempt, my desire to oblige you.

I am, dear Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

TO THE DIRECTORS OF THE THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

IF the following passages of scripture appear to be *illustrated*, you will please to insert them in your excellent publication; if not, you will do the author a kindness in suppressing this paper.

John.vi. It appears that our Saviour's miracle of feeding the five thousand, related in the beginning of this chapter, gave occasion to the highly figurative discourse which follows.

The multitudes were so astonished at the miracle, that they were for making him a king immediately; the disciples also seem not backward in their zeal on this occasion, as observed by Dr. Benson, for our Lord *constrained* them to go into the ship, and leave him, when the multitudes were pressing him to assume kingly power.

It was the general expectation of the Jews, that the Messiah was to be a *temporal prince*.

This opinion seems founded on certain prophecies which *now* appear to relate to a future deliverer of Israel, and not at all to the character of a suffering Messiah. The apostles themselves entertained the same opinion of the times, and were mistaken concerning the mission of their master, to a very late period, even after our Lord's resurrection; notwithstanding their con-

E c 2

fession

feſſion in the latter part of this chapter. See Luke xxiv. 21.

This diſcourſe ſeems intended to correct their miſtake by engaging their attention to the purpoſes of his miſſion, which had a very different end for its object, and of far greater conſequence to them than any thing temporal, or relating to *this life* could be. Full of hopes and expectations of worldly power and grandeur, what diſappointment muſt they feel at this rebuke of our Lord's, "labour not for the meat which periſheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlaſting life." He ſeems much offended with them for their worldly-mindedneſs, and their expecting a ſign from heaven in proof of his meſſiahſhip, after they had ſeen and felt ſo great a miracle. They even thought the miracle of Moſes in giving them *bread from heaven* to eat, greatly ſuperior to this of Chriſt's. Our Lord lays hold of this expreſſion, and tells them that Moſes gave them not that bread which was the *true bread from heaven*; for ſays he, ver. 33. "The bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world." The Jews underſtanding him *literally* ſay, "Lord, evermore give us this bread." Whereupon our Saviour, without correcting their prejudices, continuing the metaphor, ſays, "I am the bread of life." On another occaſion, he ſaid to Martha, "*I am the reſurrection and the life*," an expreſſion of the ſame import with this.

The doctrine of the reſurrection of the dead is continued to the fifty-eighth verſe, under the figures

figures of bread and meat. He tells them of his mission, that he was sent from God to preach the great doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; denies that Moses gave them *that* bread which he had given them. Signifying that Moses, however great he was in working miracles, yet knew nothing of this doctrine of a resurrection to eternal life; a doctrine, which was peculiarly his own, and which he had received from God himself. "*This*, he says, is that bread which "came down from heaven," in contradistinction to the bread which Moses gave them.

Ver. 60. "Many therefore of his disciples "when they heard *this*," heard what? That Jesus in this respect was superior to Moses, "said, "*this* is a hard saying; who can hear it?" And does it not continue to be a *hard saying* to the Jews of the present day?

It is the language of doubt and disappointment. Doubt, in not understanding his words; and disappointment, in their main object of pursuit, *worldly power*.

It must be remembered that the Jews, at the beginning of this discourse, had been so struck with the miracle of the loaves, &c. that they were for making him a king. How must their hopes vanish, and how greatly disappointed must they feel at hearing that *this world* was not the scene of the promised happiness; and that it was something very different indeed to their expectations! They had murmured before at our Lord's telling them that he was the bread which came down from heaven, saying, "Is not this "Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and
"mother

“mother we know?” If then they were offended with him for saying on another occasion that he was *before*, or greater than Abraham, what offence must it be to them when Jesus insinuated, that he was superior to Moses? For this is what I suppose he meant by the comparison of the manna which Moses gave them, and the true bread which came down from heaven. Jesus, not regarding their prejudices, replies, “what and “if ye shall *see* the truth of this my doctrine “come to pass in my own person; behold me “raised from the dead, and see me ascend into “heaven, the place I told you before, from “whence I received this truth, and which I “have now been revealing to you under the “figure of *bread from heaven*. It is the Spirit, “or *power of God*, by which I shall be restored “to life again; and not by any power of my “own, inherent in my nature;” for he had said before at the 57th ver. that “he lived by the “Father;” that is, by *the power* of the Father. Here our Lord speaks plainly and without a figure, and tells them, that what he had been saying, was concerning the power, the goodness, and free gift, of God, viz. the resurrection to eternal life.

This may be inferred also from the twelve understanding his meaning; and those who did not believe on him, going back, and walking no more with him. But Peter, in the name of the twelve, openly confessed his belief in his mission, and the truth of the doctrine he had been preaching to them concerning a future life,

This

This appears to me to be the most natural way of understanding the above discourse. And I here own myself not a little indebted to Dr. Priestley's *Harmony of the four Gospels*.

I shall now go on to consider some other passages of scripture, which seem to have a connexion with the language and doctrine delivered in this chapter.

John iv. Our Saviour, in his discourse with the woman of Samaria, speaks of the glorious gift of God, viz. The resurrection of the dead. The comparison he draws between the water of Jacob's well and the *water* that he would give, is similar to the manna which Moses gave and the true bread from heaven, in the above discourse, only here *water* is the metaphor instead of *bread*. So that the *circumstances* alone gave occasion to the figures in both places. And indeed they are most beautiful emblems. For as bread and water are essentially necessary to sustain *animal life*; so whosoever believed his doctrine, and lived according to it, had the promise of God himself, to be rewarded with *spiritual* or eternal life. "The water (says he) which I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life." Ver. 14. This woman also understood him *literally*; as did his disciples afterwards, when they questioned him about the *meat*. See ver. 33. But that they might not misunderstand his meaning he explains himself to them, "my meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." Our *meat* likewise is to do the very same thing, according to our proportion.

portion and the capacity given unto us. *This* is that meat which shall endure unto everlasting life. *This* is "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the son of man," "who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity."

We may observe that Jesus speaks to his disciples in plainer language, than to the Jews in general; and frequently explains himself, when alone with him. See Matt. xiv. 11.

John iii. Our Saviour having explained to Nicodemus the necessity of the two births, natural and spiritual, in these plain words, "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit" (the very same thing he said to the Jews in the sixth chapter of John, and in almost the same words. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing") Nicodemus asks, "how can these things be?" Much the same question was put to St. Paul, "how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" Our Saviour reproves him for his want of knowledge and belief in what he had told him, or that it should appear to him, *a master in Israel*, to be a thing incredible, that God should raise the dead. If, says he, ver. 12. I have told you things concerning the first birth, or production of man in this life and ye believe not, how shall ye believe or understand, if I tell you of the spiritual or future life? One would suppose from this rebuke, that Nicodemus was of the sect of the Pharisees, and had imbibed the doctrine of Plato concerning a *soul*, upon which they seem to have

have built their hopes of future life. A notion which the heathen world had eagerly caught at, and which christians have always mixed with the christian doctrine of a resurrection.

By *earthly things*, I understand the first birth, or this corruptible state of man. That this is the true meaning of the phrase is sufficiently evident from what is said at the thirty-first verse, "he that is of the earth, is earthy, and speaketh of the earth;" our future or heavenly birth not having been revealed before. St. Paul also says, "the first man is of the earth earthy," and in him, all his posterity, 1 Cor. xv. 47. ver. again, "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy," i. e. mortal, perishable, "As we have borne the image of the earthy," our first birth, "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," or resurrection state, ver. 48, 49. See also Evanston's letter to Bishop Hurd. This chapter strikes me as a good commentary on our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus. The same feelings and embarrassment are expressed at the *novelty* of the doctrine, and the seeming impossibility of the thing.

It is as clear, what is meant by *heavenly things*. Our future life is said to be from *heaven*. St. Paul says, we shall be "cloathed on with our house which is from heaven," 2 Cor. v. ver. 10. See also the following texts, 1 Cor. xv. 48, 49. Ephes. i. 3. xx. 26. 2 Tim. iv. 18. Heb. iii. 1. vi. 4. xiii. 5. ix. 23. xi. 16. xii. 22. Perhaps *heaven* in general denotes the resurrection state. May not the following texts refer to that state? Eph. i. 10. iii. 10. Col. i. 20. iii. 1. 5.

VOL. VI.

F f

Phil.

Phil. ii. 10. iii. 20. Col. i. 5. 16. Heb. x. 34. xii. 23. 1 Pet. i. 4. Matt. xxviii. 18.

Having premised thus far with respect to the meaning of the expressions *earthly* and *heavenly*, I proceed to consider the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth verses, where our Lord goes on to tell Nicodemus, that no man had attained to that state, but the son of man, who had the promise of God himself; which was as certain, as though he had already attained to the resurrection of the dead. But at the same time it had been revealed to him, that it was expedient, that he, the son of man, should suffer death, even the death of the cross; and that every one who should believe on him, would be made partakers of this heavenly kingdom.

I think there is a striking resemblance in the language of this thirteenth verse and of the sixty-second of the sixth chapter. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven but he," *the man*, "that came down from heaven, even the son of man who is in heaven." So in the other place, "and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he" as the *bread of life*, "was before." For the connexion of the discourse requires this sense. In neither place could he be, or have been, there as *son of man*. Our Saviour might be truly said to be in that kingdom to which he invited others; his first preaching was concerning the *kingdom of heaven*, or the *new doctrine* of the resurrection from the dead; and that men should repent and believe these glad tidings. In both these places our Lord foretold his resurrection and ascension into heaven.

John

John viii. 23. "Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world."

This is explained by what he had said before to Nicodemus in the third chapter, verse 3. *γεννηθῆναι ἀνωθεν*, born from above. The same phrase occurs again at the seventh verse, which fully explains the meaning of those places of scripture, where our Lord is said to be *from above*; for all christians are here said to be born *from above*. John the Baptist says, "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven," ver. 27. 31. Observe here that by the phrases *coming from above* and *coming from heaven*, nothing more is meant by the baptist than a *mission from God*. Pilate is said to have his power *from above*. See John xix. 11.

We must suppose that so great and glorious a truth, as *the resurrection*, would be the perpetual topic of Christ and his apostles; and so indeed we find it upon every occasion; but which has not been sufficiently attended to by paraphrasts and commentators. Wherever *earthly* and *heavenly*, *flesh* and *spirit*, *from above* and *beneath*, are opposed to each other, these antitheses have been supposed to allude to the different *qualities* and *affections* of the mind; rather than to the plain truth and matter of fact, viz. that our future life depended upon the free gift of God, declared by his well beloved son Jesus Christ; who constantly inculcated this great truth; and that he wrought those miracles, which they marvelled at, in confirmation of his mission being *from heaven* and not of *men*. This seems

424 *A new Interpretation of John i. 51.*

to be the grand theme of all our Saviour's and his disciples' discourses. And the *magnitude* of the doctrine required every possible demonstration of its authenticity.

John i. 51. Query, May not this verse without a metaphor, relate to our Lord's rising from the dead, and that Nathaniel should be a *witness* of his resurrection and of the attendant angels? This indeed would be seeing the greatest of all miracles. Dr. Whitby, on the place, observes, "they that interpret it of his passion and resurrection, must shew *how* it is that the angels of God ascended and descended on the son of man." We read in the gospels that angels attended his resurrection and ascension into heaven; and that they certainly did minister to him on these and other occasions; which cannot be looked on as a *common* circumstance. Hence the Doctor's difficulty vanishes.

PHILALETHES.

MARCH 8, 1783.

A Postscript to the Illustration of John iii. &c.

TO THE DIRECTORS OF THE THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

WHEN I wrote the Paper I lately took the liberty to address to you on John iii. and vi. &c. I had not seen Poole's Synopsis; wherein I think I find some remarks, which greatly strengthen mine, and which I will venture to lay before you; leaving it to your superior judgment, whether these or the former remarks deserve publication.

On considering the eighth verse of the third chapter of John, which had escaped my particular attention at the time of writing the above, I am inclined to think that the true sense and meaning is lost in our present translation. I shall not support the sense I have given to it by any criticisms in the original language, but determine its meaning by considering what goes before and what follows.

Having observed that the natural birth of man had been noticed in the sixth verse; our Lord, ver. 7. says, "marvel not, that I said unto thee, ye must be born again," or reproduced into being. Our *ignorance* in this respect can be no objection to the truth of this assertion, for as he goes on ver. 8th, with respect to this first birth,

VOL. VI.

G g

the

the *principle of life* acts as it will, and we see its operations, but cannot tell *how* to account for these circumstances. Non mirum, si regenerationem non intelligas, nam nec humanam generationem intelligis. "Anima ubi vult spirat," i. e. quæ vult animat corpora; "et vocem ejus audis," v. 9. hominem loquentem, equum hinnientem, &c. unde scis eos vivere: "nescis" tamen "unde veniat," i. e. unde gignatur, *quomodo* corpus ingrediat; "aut quo vadat," in quid definat, quomodo egrediat e corpore. Polus in loco. So is our ignorance with respect to the manner of our reproduction in a future state*.

We may remark that upon a similar question being put to St. Paul, "how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come," a similar answer is returned, "God giveth it a body, as it hath *pleased* him." (1 Cor. xv.) referring it to the will and pleasure of God. So again in Col. iii. 3. our future life is said to be "*hid in God.*" And John 1st Epist. iii. 2. "it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

Our Saviour does not satisfy Nicodemus in this matter, but tells him, that if we cannot understand the things which we daily experience in *ourselves*, how was it possible to explain things of a far superior nature.

Even at this day, we may ask, with Nicodemus, "how can these things be;" with respect to our

* Note, if το πνευμα be rightly rendered *wind* in the beginning of the eighth verse, why should the sense of τὸ πνευματικόν be different in the latter part of the same verse.

natural

natural life? *how* “in God we live and move and “have our being.” Notwithstanding we may know more concerning the human frame and its operations, than the Jews of those days did. Potuit Deus inspirando in Adamum vitam ei naturalem conferre, et non poterit meliore spiritu conferre vitam supernaturalem? id. ver. 11. To excite his attention, our Lord very seriously affirms, that he knew and perfectly understood what he had been saying, and would bear witness to the truth of his doctrine, though they (the Jews) would not receive his testimony.

We may remark that our Lord seldom or never mentions his resurrection, but at the same time intimates his violent and cruel death, which must have kept his mind from being too elated, or depressed, at the different prospects.

PHILALETHES.

*To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.*

GENTLEMEN,

AS the 5th chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians, is in general considered as clearly proving the doctrine of an intermediate state of conscious happiness or misery between death and the resurrection; and as the arguments adduced in support of that doctrine from this chapter are not only plausible, but are supposed to be conclusive against the contrary doctrine, which at present I believe to be the plain uniform doctrine of scripture; I thought it my duty seriously to consider, and endeavour to understand, the meaning and design of the apostle in this place. I enter upon it with fear, lest I should mistake or pervert the word of God. I know my own darkness and ignorance, but I look up to that God who knows my heart, that I desire with my whole soul, to know and receive his truth; that he would remove darkness and prejudice, and every thing that may prevent a proper attention to the evidence of it.

Perhaps it will be said that an enquiry into the nature, properties, and actings of the mind or soul is a subject purely philosophical and speculative, and of little, if any importance. It may be so, and so far as it is, I wish not to perplex myself with it, knowing that I am utterly unequal to such an enquiry, the investigation of which would not
only

only be unprofitable, but would require a kind of learning of which I am altogether ignorant; and I lament that the heathen notion of the soul's being an immaterial substance, naturally incorruptible and immortal (which has opened so wide a door for philosophical disquisitions, and as I apprehend is only attempted to be supported upon philosophical principles) should be introduced into the christian system as one of its great and important doctrines.—Did I say supported by philosophical principles? I will go farther, it is a doctrine the invention of which the heathen idolatrous nations were driven to, from a total ignorance and disbelief of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; as the only expedient to support the idea of a future state of rewards and punishments, and which laid the foundation of all the idolatrous worship and divine honors which those who changed the truth of God into a lie paid to their departed ancestors.—Therefore I would avoid every thing that is abstruse and philosophical, and confine myself to the plain declarations of scripture, remembering that my concern is not with heathen philosophy, but with the word and testimony of God.

In order to understand this passage, it is necessary to enquire into the meaning of the *personal pronouns* which are here used by the apostle.—(*We* know, that if this earthly house of *our* tabernacle, &c.—) because the manner in which these pronouns are here used, is supposed to furnish the most clear and undoubted proof that man's proper personality resides in his soul—that *the soul is properly the man*—that the body is but

the habitation of the soul or person, and that whether in the body or in a state of separation from it, the proper personality and powers of operation are the same; the soul being no more dependent upon the body for its existence and operations, than a man's existence and operations depend upon the house in which he dwells.—And indeed, if the soul upon the dissolution of the body, is a living intelligent being, possessed of those noble powers, and capable of those operations it is supposed to be, I apprehend the conclusion for its complete personality is inevitable, and we must admit that death is nothing more than a change of habitation, a removing from a tabernacle, a contemptible cottage, to a substantial building, an eternal house, but no change as to the person. And this is what is contended for in this passage—*For we know that if our earthly house of this our tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, &c.*

But that the antecedent noun, to which the pronoun here refers, is not the soul of the apostle (and those with whom he joins himself) as a being distinct from the body, will evidently appear to every attentive reader, if we consider the nature of the apostle's reasoning and the connection in which these words stand,

In the 19th verse of the first chapter of this epistle, the apostle mentions by name, the persons to whom the pronoun here refers.—*Me* (i. e. Paul) *and Silvanus, and Timotheus*; in the next chapter he says, *thanks be unto God, who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place.*
For

For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ.—

In the 4th chapter the apostle is still pursuing the same subject, namely, the excellency of the ministry which they had received, and their plainness, intrepidity, and faithfulness in preaching the gospel, commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God—*having obtained mercy* (says he) *we faint not, but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty.*—It is impossible, I apprehend, to suppose that these pronouns are designed to refer the personality of the apostles to their souls, as intelligent spiritual beings, distinct from, and inhabiting, their bodies; but they must be understood as referring to their complete persons, to which all their actions, whether of body or mind, must be referred, and not to the different parts of which the person is composed; as the apostle says, Rom. vii. and last, *with the mind*, myself serve the law of God; but *with the flesh*, the law of sin. The pronoun is the same in both clauses, and both the acts are to be referred to the same individual person, which is common both to the mind and to the flesh.—But this application of the pronoun will receive abundant strength and support, if we consider what the apostle says farther, concerning himself and the rest of the apostles, *We have* (says he) *this treasure*, i. e. the blessings of the glorious gospel of Christ, *in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us, troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the*

G g 4

life

life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body; for we, who live are always delivered unto death for Jesus sake (or as the same apostle says, Rom. viii. 36. For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter) *that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.* The being delivered to death, is here predicated, not simply of the body, or the mortal flesh, but of the persons claiming a propriety in the body, to whom it belongs. *We* are delivered to death, that the life of Jesus might be made manifest in *our* mortal flesh. Is it possible to refer these pronouns to an immortal being? to the soul as an intelligent immaterial substance, distinct from the body, as it is contended they should be in the first verse of the next chapter; most certainly not. Had that been the apostle's idea, he would doubtless have made use of expressions to the following effect, "our mortal part, our bodies" are delivered to death for Jesus sake; but *we*, "the immortal souls who inhabit these tabernacles, are beyond the power of death, we shall live and triumph with Jesus for ever;" but this is no where the language of the apostle, but quite the reverse. *We* (says he) in whose body the life of Jesus is made manifest; *we*, who know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved, *we* have a building of God, *we* are delivered to death for Jesus sake.

Let us consider man as compounded of two essentially different natures, a mortal body, and an immortal soul; let us analyze him, take him apart as it were, and we shall find that the personal pronoun (*we*) here used, cannot without manifest

manifest impropriety be referred to either of those natures; not to the body, because that would make the apostle distinguish his body from his body; nor is it that I know of, ever contended, that man's personality is to be referred to the body; and if we refer the pronoun to the *immortal soul*, there is something exceedingly marvellous in the idea of that *immortal* substance being delivered to death, and killed for the sake of Jesus, as the apostle says they were. Nor is what follows less marvellous (if the pronouns be designed to refer the personality to the soul) that is, that the apostle should make their firmness in preaching the gospel, to arise from their full persuasion and unshaken confidence that, should they seal their testimony with their blood, yet God would raise *them* (that is, *their never dying souls*) from the *dead*, even as he had raised up the Lord Jesus; for certainly when he says, *we* having the same spirit of faith, the pronoun cannot be referred altogether, if at all, to the body, for it is the soul that is purified in obeying the truth through the spirit; faith is not the act of the body, but of the mind. *We* believe (says he) therefore *we* speak, knowing that he who raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up *us* also by Jesus, and shall present *us* with you.—The resurrection of the dead, and the glory which was to be revealed in them, at the appearing of Jesus, was the great object the apostles had in view, which supported them under all the afflictions that they endured; therefore, says he, we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day, for the unseen things which

which we contemplate are eternal; they are a weight of glory, far exceeding all our present momentary and light afflictions, which are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us; and that God will thus raise us up, and present us with you, to this exceeding glory, we have the most full assurance and well grounded confidence; *for we know* that if this earthly house of our tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens.

I cannot help observing here, what a plain and necessary connection there is between this and the preceding chapter. The personality to which the pronoun refers, is the same through the whole, there is not the least appearance of a change of person, and all that is here said of the apostles, was strictly true, as applied to their proper persons; but if the personality is to be referred to the immortal soul, it cannot be contended, there is not a pretence to say, that the things here affirmed of the apostles were true of that person.—On the other hand, if in order to form a consistency, we say, that the personality is not to be referred to the soul only, but that the immortal soul and the body are both essential constituent parts of the person, and therefore the pronoun may be referred to either, and must be understood of that part of the person to which it will best apply; this, instead of explaining, in my opinion, will introduce the greatest confusion and absurdity into the whole of the apostles discourse, which will stand thus, “*We* (that is we bodies) preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord—

We,

We (that is we souls) have this treasure in earthen vessels (that is, in bodies)—*We* (that is we bodies) are delivered to death for Jesus sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in *our* (that is our souls) mortal flesh—*We* (that is we souls) having the spirit of faith, *we* believe and therefore—*We* (that is we bodies) speak, knowing that he who raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up *us* (that is us bodies) also by Jesus; therefore *We* (that is we immortal souls) faint not, while we look at the things which are not seen, for we know that if his earthly house, &c. Such confusion, such a division and distinction of the person from itself, is the inevitable consequence of the doctrine I oppose, which I have endeavoured to represent in its true colours, and which thus undisguised, exhibits such a picture, as will not bear looking at.—But laying aside all the apparent absurdity of it, what is there to support such an equivocal application of the pronoun? Has the apostle told us, that man consists of a mortal body and an immortal soul? and that we must never lose sight of this distinction, if we would understand him in this or any other part of his writings; so far from it, that in the whole of this connection (though in no place could such a distinction be more necessary than in this, if it was founded in truth) he has not so much as once mentioned the soul, or given the least intimation that man is possessed of such an immortal substance.

We may farther observe, that the apostles do not give the most distant hint, that immediately upon the death of the body their souls would be transported

transported to realms of inconceivable felicity in the presence of Christ at God's right hand, and that the prospect of the glory of that separate state kept them from fainting; but he fixes his eye (as it were) immediately upon the resurrection of the dead, and speaks of *that* as the sole ground of their support and comfort under their present afflictions. We preach Jesus in the face of all opposition not regarding our lives, knowing — what? that if we die in his cause our souls will immediately enter into that fulness of joy that is in the presence of God; no such thing, but knowing this that if we die for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, he who raised up the Lord Jesus from the dead, and thereby shewed him the path of life, and made him full of joy with his countenance, he will raise up us also by Jesus, and present us with you in that glory which shall be revealed at the appearing of Jesus Christ.

Is it not astonishing that the apostle should constantly look to so remote a period, and blessings at so great a distance as the resurrection of the dead, if he had any idea of a previous intermediate state of glory, which would immediately succeed and swallow up all the trials and afflictions of this present life.—And that not a glory consisting in the outward fashion, splendour, and immortality of his unintelligent nature, his body, but a glory infinitely more desirable, the glory of his immortal soul, of all those intelligent, those noble powers and faculties of the mind, which alone (according to this hypothesis) are capable of contemplating the glorious excellencies of the everlasting

everlasting God, and of being satiated and filled with his infinite fulness.

If the doctrine of the soul's immortality and intermediate state of glory, had formed a part of the apostles creed, should we not find him frequently dwelling upon it with rapture and delight, and urging it upon the churches as a matter, the knowledge of which was essential to their comfort and support under their present trials. If we may judge from feelings and experience, we have the highest reason to believe we should: But instead of this, he has not so much as once mentioned it in any of his epistles to the churches, even in that to the church at Ephesus, from whom he says, he had kept back nothing that was profitable to them, but had declared to them the whole counsel of God; yet in that epistle there is not the least trace of this doctrine.—When he stood arraigned before the Jewish high priest in the midst of a large assembly, composed partly of the Sadducees (who denied this doctrine in all its parts, as well as the resurrection of the dead) and partly of the Pharisees (who are supposed to have believed both) he takes a decided part, he avows himself a Pharisee, in opposition to the doctrine of the Sadducees; yet even then, when so favourable an opportunity offered, he does not so much as mention his belief of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and an intermediate state; but cries out I am a Pharisee.—Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question, Acts xxiii. 6.—And in the following chapter, when he is defending himself from the charge of heresy which was brought against him, he

he makes a confession of his faith, of the doctrine he preached, and of the ground of his hope towards God; but the doctrine of a separate state, and the immortality of the soul, makes no part of that creed; and yet had it been a truth, it had such a natural connection with those articles of his faith here laid down, and was such an essential branch of his hope towards God, that such an omission in a modern confession, would be thought a sufficient ground to suspect a man's orthodoxy.—*After the way (says he) which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets, and have hope towards God (which they themselves also allow) that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*

Again, when the apostle is instructing the Thessalonians, concerning the state of departed believers (of which he says, he would not have them to be ignorant, lest they should sorrow even as others who had no hope) this doctrine seems not to have entered into his head; and yet if he could have affirmed with truth that their departed friends were in heaven, surrounding the throne of God and the Lamb; it would have been (as it is found to be at this day) the most natural, the most effectual, and substantial ground of comfort. How does he describe their state? *They are fallen asleep (says he) they are dead in Christ.* But God will raise them from the dead, *for as Jesus DIED and ROSE again, even so, them also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him, for the dead in Christ shall arise when the Lord himself shall descend from heaven,*

heaven, and together with those who are alive, shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so (says he) shall we ever be with the Lord, wherefore comfort one another with these words.—He does not say a word about their being alive, or in a state of happiness;—but if they were alive, if the apostle believed and was persuaded that they were entered into a state of felicity, it will be difficult, I believe, to vindicate either his wisdom or his faithfulness, in suppressing a truth so important, so profitable, and so essential to the comfort of the Thessalonians and of christians in all succeeding ages, as the doctrine of the intermediate state of blessedness, which the souls of the faithful enter into at death.—The apostles successors however have been wise enough to discover, and have abundantly supplied this defect.

But I proceed to consider what the apostle intends by the earthly house of the tabernacle, and the building of God, the house eternal in the heavens, which he here opposes to it.

First. By the figure of a *tabernacle* the apostle here represents the present state and condition of man, for this cannot be applied to the body of man, in his original state of purity and perfection; when (sin not having entered into the world) man's nature was a stranger to corruption and mortality, having no seeds of corruption in himself, and being (while he remained in that state of innocence) invulnerable to every appendage of dissolution and death from without; for by sin, and in no other way could death enter into the world; so that the metaphor of a *tabernacle* is in no wise suited to the body of man in
that

that state of sinless perfection, of (at least conditional) immortality.

Secondly. As the word tabernacle is not applicable to the body of man in his original estate, neither doth the apostle allude to the origin of man's body; in the other part of the description, when he styles the tabernacle the *earthly house*. The words *ἐπίγειον οἶκος* signify a house *on* the earth, and opposed to the building afterwards mentioned, which is said to be *in* the heavens. The word *χοϊνός* earthy, 1 Cor. xv. 47. is of very different import, and is expressive of man's original, as being formed *ἐκ γῆς* out of the earth, and so earthy; as man is said, Gen. ii. 7. to be formed of the dust of the ground, which is not said of man's *house* or *tabernacle*, but of *man* himself. *The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.* The apostle speaking of the difference between the body when sown, and that with which the dead shall be raised, says *it is sown a natural* (*ψυχικόν* or animal) *body, it is raised a spiritual body; there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body;* and then in order to prove that there is a natural body, he adds, *and so it is written* (citing the passage in Genesis) *the first man Adam was made ἐκ γῆς ζώσαν* *into a living soul;* but the words *earthly house* are not, as I have observed, designed to express man's original formation *out* of the earth; but his present habitation which is *on* the earth, and it is called a tabernacle to point out his present state of corruption, mortality, and death. Pool says of the word tabernacle, which is here opposed

posed to a building, that it fitly signifies the frail condition of the body, and of this life*.

Thirdly. The apostle doth not speak of this tabernacle as the tabernacle of the soul, nor is there any thing in the connexion (as I think I have shewn at large) to lead us to consider the pronoun *our* as referring to the immortal soul, as a person distinct from, and so inhabiting the body, as to be capable of egression and conscious existence, independent of the body; for the question is not whether the soul is in the body, or whether the mind and body are distinguishable and capable of being differently affected in the present state; but whether the mind or soul is a substance so absolutely distinct from, and independent of the body, as not to be affected by its dissolution; but retaining when the tabernacle is removed, the essential properties of a person, and all those powers of operation, reflection, and enjoyment which the mind of man is capable of, in its present state of union with the body—which leads me to observe,

Fourthly. That the nature of this tabernacle, and the connexion that there is between it and its inhabitant is such as is peculiar to this, and cannot be affirmed of any other tabernacle.

In the first place, it is a living tabernacle, the life of which is the very life of its inhabitant.—It is a tabernacle subject to dissolution, *it shall be dissolved*; and this *dissolution* is not only called, but is in fact the *death* of the person whose tabernacle

* Quod caducam corporis et hujus vite conditionem apte significat. Synopsis crit. in loco.

it is.—None of these things can be affirmed of tents or tabernacles which men set up ; there is no such mutual dependence and connexion between them and their owners, as to have such a reciprocal influence upon each other.

Secondly. Tabernacles in general, are tents which men pitch for their own present use and convenience, and which they take down or strike when there is no farther occasion for them ; but none of this is true of the tabernacle of which we are speaking ; man's present state as in a tabernacle, is involuntary, is that to which sin has reduced him ; whereby he is brought into the bondage of corruption, and under the power of death.—So far is this tabernacle from being a desirable habitation, a place of convenience and rest, that it is represented as man's burden, under which he groans, desiring to be clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life. We (says the apostle) who have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body. Rom. viii. 23. This tabernacle is that BODY of DEATH which makes man truly miserable, and causes him to cry out, Oh ! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me ? *ibid.* vii. 24. Oh what a change has sin introduced into the nature of man. When God made him a living soul, he was perfect, possessed of compleat uninterrupted felicity, unacquainted with sorrow, incapable of dissolution, the BODY of DEATH had then no existence—all this ruin and destruction is the effect of the first transgression.

Thirdly.

Thirdly. As the term *dissolution* is inapplicable to all tabernacles, except that of which we are treating; so also are those phrases of being **CLOATHED** with, and **PUTTING OFF**, this tabernacle. We never speak thus of a man's house or tent. This is language peculiar to the scriptures, and is designed to shew that the connexion which there is between a man's person and the earthly house of his tabernacle, is such as the word tabernacle alone is insufficient to describe; and therefore the apostle connects those other ideas with it, representing man's putting off his tabernacle as a deliverance, which is accomplished not merely by *taking down* the tabernacle, or the person's departure out of it; but by the dissolution and destruction of the tabernacle itself: I must put off this tabernacle, says Peter. It is the same as if he had said, I must die; it is by death that man puts off his mortality, his earthly tabernacle; and in the resurrection from the dead, will put on immortality, just as the grain which is sown in the earth dies, is raised up, and God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body, &c. So also is the resurrection of the dead. Again,

Fourthly. The manner in which the apostle expresses himself in this place, shews that he founded all his expectations of future happiness, upon an assurance of his being raised up and clothed upon with another *house*, and not upon the dissolution of his earthly tabernacle, the destruction of which, without his being reclothed with another house, would (as his words evidently imply) leave him in a state of perdition and

H h 2

death,

death. For if the apostle expected the glorification of his *naked soul* (if I may be allowed the expression) immediately upon the dissolution of his body; why should he say, we look at those things which are eternal; for we know that when this earthly house of our tabernacle *shall have been dissolved* (as Mr. Pool renders it*) we have a building of God; a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens?—What could another house have to do with the glory of his separate spirit, antecedent to mortality being swallowed up of life; or what house could the apostle mean to oppose to the body, if he is speaking of that state? But so far was the apostle from supposing or expecting that his soul in a disembodied, naked state, would enter into the celestial glory; that when he had said, *we who are in this tabernacle, groan, being burdened*, lest it should be construed (for these words would bear such a construction) to favour the heathen doctrine of the soul's immortality and glory, without the body, he denies in express terms; that to have been his meaning. He had no such idea; *not* (says he) *that we would be unclothed*, but on the contrary affirms, that their groaning *was that mortality might be swallowed up of life*, which he tells us (1 Cor. xv. 54) will be accomplished in the resurrection of the just—*when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.*—To that period,

* *Synopsis crit. in loco.*

and that event, the apostle must refer here, because his words cannot be understood in any other sense; for till the resurrection of the dead, the body will remain under the power of corruption and death, and if the soul is already *immortal*, its separate glorification will only be a farther manifestation and enjoyment of that immortality, but in no sense would that glorification swallow up mortality of life.

From hence I observe, how unreasonable it is to infer from the words of the apostle, Phil. i. 23. that he believed in the present immortality of the soul, and expected, that upon his departure out of the world, *his naked soul stripped of the body would immediately be with Christ*; when, those words not only have no such *necessary* implication; but he has here so expressly disavowed such an idea, and assured us that he had no such meaning, even when he made use of those strong expressions which occur in this chapter, such as, *we know that we have a building of God, a house eternal in the heavens, when this earthly house of our tabernacle is dissolved—being absent from the body we shall be present with the Lord, &c.* expressions so strong as not to be paralleled by any thing that he has said in his epistle to the Philippians, or in any other part of his writings; which made it absolutely necessary that he should (as he here does) explain himself and guard against such an idea.

Besides every thing in the epistle to the Philippians is against such an interpretation. The apostle twice in that chapter directs the Philippians to the day of Christ, as the important

period, when it would be their glory and happiness to be found sincere and without offence ;— as the time until which he was persuaded God would perform the good work which he had begun in them *.—Is it possible then to suppose, that having directed them to look to, and wait for the second appearing of Christ ; he meant to inform them in the 23d verse, that he himself looked to a different, to a more recent period, for his reward and crown—that he expected and believed his soul would go to heaven, and be with Christ before that day !—The supposition, in my opinion, is not only absurd, but also destitute of the least support from what he there says. For he is not speaking of his *soul*, that Christ would be glorified in that, whether it remained in the body or was taken immediately to glory, but of his *body*, in which he was confident Christ would be glorified, whether by life or death, which the following words are designed to prove, and it was between these two (i. e. between life and death) that the apostle was in a strait, not knowing which to choose, having a *desire to depart and be with Christ*, which (says he) is far better. Whatever might be the desire of the apostle, he no where tells us that he had any ground to expect, or that he did in fact expect that his soul would be with Christ, before his second coming to receive his people to himself ; and as he directs the Philippians to look to that period, he tells them in the third chapter that, that was the end which he kept in view ; the

* Phil. i. 6. 11.

mark of the prize to which he was pressing forward; that I might (says he) attain unto the resurrection of the dead, and adds, *our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ*. What strange language is this for the apostle to use? if when he told this church, that he had a desire to depart and to be with Christ; he meant (as it is contended he did mean) to prove the doctrine of the soul's *immortality*, and that he had a *firm* expectation, and the most full assurance that he should not *wait* for the crown of righteousness which was laid up for him, *till the return of Christ from heaven*, but should shortly *follow* him:—be *with him immediately* upon his departure out of this world; and continue *where* he is, enjoying his presence—beholding his glory—singing his praises—partaking of the heavenly felicity for ages, and at last make one of his retinue that shall accompany him when he shall come the second time, without sin unto salvation.—To call this a *waiting* for God's Son *from heaven* (1 Theff. i. 10.) has something so ridiculous in it, that it needs no animadversion. To *wait* for the return of a person from a far country, by *following* of him, is such a kind of *waiting* as I am utterly unacquainted with, and have no conception of.—We *look* for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven. This *looking* cannot be restrained to the *body* only, because of what follows, *who shall change our vile body, &c.* besides, in that case the apostle might with equal propriety have added, *we wait also for ourselves from heaven*.—We wait for our immortal souls to

H h 4

descend,

descend, in order to a reunion with the body.—When therefore we read this, and similar passages, we certainly must conclude, that the apostle never intended by saying that, *he had a desire to depart and be with Christ*, to establish the doctrine of the soul's immortality and felicity, in a state of separation from the body; or if he did, that when he wrote these words, he had either forgotten his preceding desire, or had seen reason to alter his mind.

But I forbear to enlarge, and proceed to enquire what that *building* is, which the apostle here calls *an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens*. There are only two senses in which this is generally understood. "It is to be understood, as Mr. Pool says *, "either first of the celestial blessedness, according to that of our Lord, "John xiv. 2. or, secondly, of the glorious body, "which will be celestial and spiritual, of which "we read, 1 Cor. xv. 44. 46. 48. 49."—and adds "so almost all interpreters understand it."

Celestial blessedness are words as well calculated to express the glorious state of the saints after the resurrection, as they can be to describe a state of glory antecedent to it.—If Mr. Poole meant by them to convey the idea of a state of heavenly felicity, into which the soul would be introduced immediately upon the death of the body (as I think from his making the resurrection glory the other sense of the words he certainly did) the words have no such necessary meaning, and the passage he has cited, is exceeding adverse

... * Synopsis criticorum in loco.

to

to it. Our Lord there says, that in his father's house are many mansions; to which he will introduce his disciples. But how is that to be done? he does not say, I go away, but you shall shortly follow me; I will send an envoy of angels to fetch your immortal souls home to myself; but on the contrary, *if I go away, I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am you may be also*—directing their faith to that day, when all nations shall be gathered before him, and he shall introduce all his faithful followers into those everlasting mansions; saying, “come ye blessed of my father inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” To that time those words *I will come again*, evidently refer, when he shall judge the quick and the dead, at his *appearing* and kingdom, when the *Lord himself* shall descend with a shout, &c. when he shall *appear* the *second* time without sin unto salvation, Heb. ix. 28.

But the other sense (namely, that this *house* refers to the *spiritual body* which the saints shall receive at the resurrection of the dead) is that to which Mr. Pool evidently gives the preference, and to a supposed objection, that according to this sense, “the apostle doth not properly say *we have*, that is to say, immediately after dissolution, as Paul’s scope sheweth,”—he gives the following answers, *First* that, “the *present* is here put for the *future*, *we shall have*; so of the believer, it said he *hath* eternal life, John iii. 36, and vi. 47. and so Paul, speaking of the *future resurrection* makes use of a word of the *present* sense, 1 Cor. xv. 43. *it is raised in glory, it is*
“*raised*”

“*raised a spiritual body. Secondly, that, laid up,*
 “*or reserved is well understood after we have,*
 “*because of what follows, in heaven. Thirdly,*
 “*that the scope of the apostle is the future glory*
 “*of the ministers which he treats of in general,*
 “*whether it pertaineth to the body, or to the*
 “*soul, and whether it is immediately possessed at*
 “*death, or long after, for he is making mention*
 “*of the resurrection a little before.*”

Dr. Whitby understands this *building of God* to refer to the glorious bodies with which the saints shall be cloathed upon, at the resurrection. His paraphrase of the beginning of the chapter, is this, “for we know that if our earthly house of
 “this tabernacle were dissolved, we have (*pro-*
 “*vided for us, at the restoring of it*) a building of
 “God, an house not made with hands, eternal
 “in the heavens. For in this (*tabernacle*) we
 “groan, earnestly desiring to be cloathed upon
 “with our house which is from heaven (*We are,*
 “*I say, desirous of this*) if so be that (*or seeing*
 “*that, at the resurrection*) being cloathed, we
 “shall not be found naked (i. e. *since then we shall*
 “*not be found naked, as the wicked, but cloathed*
 “*with a body not subject to death*) and in his
 “notes on verse 1st, he says, the apostle cannot
 “here be supposed to mean, that as soon as ever
 “good christians die, they shall be cloathed upon
 “with this house, which is from heaven, but
 “only that they shall be so at the resurrection.—
 “For (1st.) we *christians*, saith he, groan earnest-
 “ly, desiring to be cloathed upon with this
 “house, ver. 2. Now, saith the same apostle, we
 “ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for
 “the

“ the adoption, that is, the redemption of the
 “ body, Rom. viii. 23. (2dly.) They groaned to
 “ be cloathed upon, that mortality might be swal-
 “ lowed up of life, ver. 4. Now, when this cor-
 “ ruptible shall have put on incorruption, and
 “ this mortal, immortality, then only shall be
 “ brought to pass the saying that is written,
 “ death is swallowed up of victory, 1 Cor. xv. 54.
 “ and afterwards he says, there shall be an
 “ *ἐνδύματα*, a cloathing of the body raised, with a
 “ covering that shall preserve it from corruption.
 “ This is plainly the apostle’s meaning, in the
 “ similitude of grain rising not *naked*, as it was
 “ sown, but *cloathed upon*, see 1 Cor. xv. 37;
 “ this I think is the meaning of those words, ver. 3.
 “ *if so be, or seeing we shall be, ενδυσασμενοι, cloathed*
 “ *upon*, as the bodies of the just will be, and
 “ not *γυμνοι naked*, as the bodies of the wicked
 “ shall be. For that the wicked shall have im-
 “ mortal bodies at the resurrection, I no where
 “ find clearly delivered in the holy scripture.”

Mr. Locke understood the apostle as speaking
 of the celestial body, when he here says, we have
 a *building* of God, &c. and paraphrases the verse
 in the following manner:—“ For I know that if
 “ this my *body*, which is but a tent for my so-
 “ journeying here upon earth for a short time, were
 “ dissolved; I have *another* of a divine original,
 “ which shall not, like buildings made with mens
 “ hands, be subject to decay, but shall be eternal
 “ in the heavens.”

In his notes on the 4th verse, he says—“ This
 “ I must own is no very easy passage, whether
 “ we understand by *γυμνοι naked*, as I do here the
 “ state

“state of the dead, unclothed with immortal
 “bodies, till the resurrection, which sense is fa-
 “voured by the same word, 1 Cor. xv. 37, or
 “whether we understand the *cloathing upon*, which
 “the apostle desires, to be those immortal bodies,
 “which *souls*” (or rather in the language of scrip-
 “ture, the dead) “shall be clothed with at the
 “resurrection, which sense of *cloathing upon*,
 “seems to be favored by 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54
 “and this is that which one should be inclined
 “to, were it not accompanied with this diffi-
 “culty, viz. that then it would follow that the
 “wicked should not have *immortal bodies* at the
 “resurrection.—For whatever it be that St. Paul
 “here means by being *cloathed upon*, it is some-
 “thing that is peculiar to the saints, who have
 “the spirit of God, and shall be with the Lord in
 “contra-distinction to others, as appears from
 “the following verses, and the whole tenor of
 “this place.”

The whole difficulty with Mr. Locke appears
 to have been, how to reconcile what the apostle
 here says with the *immortality* of the *wicked after*
the resurrection, which he takes for granted, as
 though it were an unquestionable truth; but in
 this he was certainly mistaken, for the scripture
 never represents the final state of the wicked as a
 state of *immortality*; but, on the contrary, as a
 state of *corruption, perdition, and death*.—Which
 consideration at once removes all the obscurity
 and difficulty which Mr. Locke seemed to think
 this passage was involved in.

Dr. Wells in his paraphrase on the New Testa-
 ment, understands the apostle, when he says, we
 have

have a building of God, &c. as speaking of the glorious state of the body after the resurrection. His words are, "we have a building, i. e. *a celestial body provided us of God,*" and in the next verse, "desiring to be *cloathed as it were upon this body,* with our house, which is from heaven, i. e. *our celestial body.*"

These, with every other expositor which I have had an opportunity of consulting, who have given the passage a moment's consideration, appear to have understood the apostle in this place, as having his eye upon the resurrection, and as contrasting the *glory, immortality, and incorruption* of the spiritual heavenly body, with the dishonor, mortality, and corruption of the natural earthly body, and the apostle's expectation of future happiness, arising from an assurance that he should be cloathed with the one when he was divested of the other.

I have not cited Crellius, Socinus, Dr. Priestley, or any of those writers on this passage, who deny the immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of a separate state, who might be supposed to strain the words beyond their plain and natural import, in order to support or favour their particular sentiments. But I have cited those only who believe that doctrine, and who have taken great pains to understand the apostle, and yet they do not, any of them seem to have seen the least trace of that doctrine in this passage, which is considered by *inattentive, prejudiced* persons as one of the most clear and explicit revelations of it.

But in addition to what has been said, I beg leave to observe the following things :

In

In the first place, the contrast in the text evidently shews, that by the *earthly* and *heavenly* house, the apostle meant the *natural* and *spiritual* body, both being represented as having a near connexion with the person, as that with which man is clothed. The *heavenly house* is opposed to the *earthly*, and is that with which the believer is to be invested in its stead, when the *earthly* shall have been dissolved; the *earthly* is a *tabernacle*, the *other* is a *building*; the *earthly* is subject to decay, and corruption, through sin; the *other* is *permanent*, *incorruptible*, and *eternal*. All this perfectly agrees with the account the apostle gives of the natural and spiritual body in the 15th chap. of his first epistle to the Corinthians; but we have no warrant that I know of, from the scriptures to contrast *heaven* as the saints future *habitation*, with their *mortal body* as their present *tabernacle*. That however is impossible to be the contrast in this passage, for the *heavens* here stand directly opposed to the *earth*, the house not made with hands is IN the HEAVENS, and is opposed to the tabernacle, which is said to be ON the EARTH.—Neither is *heaven* ever represented as the *cloathing* of the saints, as this *house* is said to be, *desiring to be clothed upon with our house from heaven*.

Secondly, The apostle further describing this *house* with which they desired earnestly to be clothed upon; says it is FROM heaven, and therefore it cannot possibly be *heaven* itself, but this also agrees exactly with what we read of the spiritual body, which is not of the heavens heavenly, as the natural was out of the earth earthy,

as the reasoning of the apostle in 1 Cor. 15. shews, *as is the earthy, such are they that are earthy, and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly, and as we have born the image of the earthy, we shall also* (says he, speaking of the resurrection) *bear the image of the heavenly.* Now the spiritual body may be said to be *from* heaven, either in the first place, because it is *from* God—the work and the gift of God; so the apostle illustrating the doctrine of the resurrection, by the springing up of seed that was sown in the earth, says that *God giveth* it a body as seemeth good to him. The *gospel*, spiritual wisdom, with every good and perfect gift, because they are of God, are said to come *from* heaven, to come down *from above*, from the father of lights. So here the heavenly house is said to be a building of God, and the Saviour whom we expect *from* heaven, shall change our vile body, that he may fashion it like unto his own *glorious body*, which is that *heavenly* image to which we are to be conformed.—Or, secondly, it may be said to be *from* heaven, because of its nature, which will be *heavenly, spiritual, immortal*, by which it will be suited to the *heavenly* state, and capable of enjoying all that glory and felicity which springs from the immense fulness, and presence of the ever blessed God, which felicity we are now utterly incapacitated for.—*Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.* Oh how shall we be changed? we are lost in the contemplation of it; for it does not yet appear, what the sons of God shall be; how *heavenly*, how *spiritual* their natures shall be,
but

but this we know they shall be like him, for they shall see him as he is.

Thirdly, The apostle speaks, with great certainty as to their being brought to the possession of this house; *we know that—we have a building of God*. It was not a mere matter of *conjecture*, but of *knowledge*, founded upon the divine testimony, and of *hope* built upon the promise of God who cannot lie, which is the only foundation of faith and hope, respecting future and eternal things.—But where is the promise to be found, upon which the apostle could rest with such unshaken confidence that his *soul* should be introduced into a state of glory and happiness before the resurrection? I am satisfied such a promise is not to be found in any part of the sacred writings.

The *promise* of God, which is the ground of the believers *hope*, is the promise of *eternal life*. *This is the promise which he hath promised us, eternal life*, 1 John ii. 25. *In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie promised before the world began*, Titus i. 2. But when shall the believer be put in possession of this eternal life? The scripture tells us it will be the effect and consequence of the decisions of the great and terrible day of the Lord. The apostle tells us in the 2d of the Romans, that in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, and render to every man according to his works, he will render *eternal life* to them, who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality; and our lord describing the nature of the general judgment, concludes the account of the whole process with the final sentence, which shall

shall be passed both upon the righteous and the wicked: *These* (that is the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into *life eternal*.—The promise of eternal life, points to the resurrection. *This is the will of him that sent me* (saith Christ) *that he who seeth the son and believeth on him may have everlasting life*. How does that appear? how shall it be brought about? why says he, *I will raise him up at the last day*, John vi. 40.—Paul when standing before King Agrippa, tells him, that for the *hope* of the *promise* made of God unto the fathers, (unto which the twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night, says he, hope to come) I am accused of the Jews, and immediately adds, why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead? Acts xxvi. 6, 7, 8. and in chap. xxiii. 6. and xxiv. 15. he tells us, that this hope founded in the promise of God, for the sake of which he stood accused, was the *hope* of the *resurrection* of the *dead*.—And he never tells us that he knew of any *promise* of *eternal life*, or ground of hope, short of the resurrection of the dead. Had the apostle meant any thing else when he said, *we know that we have a building of God, &c.* he certainly would have some where let us into the secret, how he came by this knowledge, and the ground of his faith and confidence, that we might build upon the same foundation, and be partakers of the same hope; but so far was the apostle from insinuating such an idea, as that his hope respected any thing previous to the resurrection; that he tells us but just before, that he had his eye upon the resur-

VOL. VI.

I i

rection

rection as the ground of his hope, and the source of his consolation, under his present afflictions. *Knowing that he who raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise us up by Jesus, and present us with you.*

I shall close the whole that I mean to say on this verse, with one general observation, namely, that the scripture constantly teaches us to consider the appearing of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment, as near at hand, without taking the least notice of any intervening period, or intermediate state, between our departure out of this world, and the accomplishment of those great events. The sudden and speedy appearing of Christ, is the motive which the New Testament continually makes use of to quicken our diligence in doing the will of God, to encourage us to persevere in the christian race, to endure patiently afflictions, reproaches, persecutions, and even death itself for righteousness sake, that we may obtain a better resurrection. That this is the scripture representation of the coming of Christ, will appear from the following passages, Luke xxi. 34, 35, 36. Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and cares of this life, and so *that day* come upon you unawares; for as a snare shall it come on *all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth*. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the son of man. — This I apprehend is no part of a preceeding prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, but of the day of judgment.—Peter says in 1 epist. iv. 5. that

that wicked men shall " give account to him
 " who is *ready* to judge the quick and the dead.
 " —And v. 7. The end of all things is at hand,
 " be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer.—
 " Again, 2 Pet. iii. 10—14 *The day of the Lord*
 " *will come as a thief in the night*, in the which
 " the heavens shall pass away with a great noise,
 " and the elements shall melt with fervent heat,
 " the earth also, and the works that are therein shall
 " be burned up. Seeing then that all these things
 " shall be dissolved, what manner of persons
 " ought ye to be in all holy conversation and
 " godliness. Looking for, and hasting unto
 " the coming of the day of God, wherein the
 " heavens being on fire, shall be dissolved, and
 " the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Ne-
 " vertheless, we, according to his promise, look
 " for new heavens and a new earth, wherein
 " dwelleth righteousness; wherefore, beloved,
 " seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent
 " that ye may be found of him in peace without
 " spot and blameless.—James v. 7, 8, 9. Be pa-
 " tient, therefore brethren *unto the coming of the*
 " *Lord*. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the
 " precious fruit of the earth, and hath long pa-
 " tience for it, until he receive the early and late-
 " ter rain; be ye also patient, stablish your hearts
 " for *the coming of the Lord draweth nigh*. Grudge
 " not one against another brethren lest ye be con-
 " demned, *behold the judge standeth before the*
 " *door*. John saith to the seven churches, Rev.
 " i. 7. Behold he (i. e. Christ) cometh with
 " clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they
 " also that pierced him; and all kindreds of the
 " earth

“earth shall wail, because of him.—And Jesus saith, chap. xxii. 7. Behold *I come quickly*, “blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of this “book. Again ver. 12. Behold *I come quickly* “and my reward is with me, to give every man “according as his work shall be. And again, “ver. 20. He who resisteth these things saith, “*surely I come quickly*. Amen, even so come “Lord Jesus.”—The truth of all these declarations depends entirely upon the immediate connexion which the scriptures constantly maintain between our departure out of this world, and the general judgment; which is such a connexion as precludes every idea of an intervening period, and cuts off every ground of hope, or fear of reward, or punishment, before the resurrection of the dead; for there is not a promise, or a threatening in all the scriptures, respecting the world to come, but what depends entirely upon the resurrection for its accomplishment. When I say this, I speak with confidence, because the truth of it depends not upon any nice criticism, or inference drawn from an obscure passage or uncertain promises, but upon matter of fact, which is open to examination; and therefore if I am mistaken, the mistake may be easily pointed out.

The apostle, writing to the Thessalonians, says; we beseech you brethren, by (or concerning) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the *day of Christ is at hand*; and then he goes on to prove that that *day* would not be in that, or any
of

of the immediately succeeding ages of the world. But this was not designed to contradict those passages I have just cited, with many others which speak of the day of the Lord as near. No, there is a sense in which it then was, and still is strictly true, that the day of the Lord is at hand, and on account of the visible approach of which believers are called upon to exhort one another so much the more. This was not literally true (as we have seen) as to that time or age of the world, for many ages have elapsed, but the end is not yet, —nor am I able to discover any possible sense in which it could be true, if the persons to whom these things were written, were after death to retain a conscious existence, and live in a state of felicity through all the succeeding ages of the world, till the revelation of Christ. But if we adopt the scripture idea of an immediate connexion between death and judgment, we shall easily understand the meaning of the apostle when he says, the day of the Lord is at hand, and triumphs at the thought of his appearing, desiring to be dissolved, and be with him, to be clothed upon with his house from heaven, that mortality might be absorbed of life; we have but to look to the verge of time, to contemplate the uncertainty of life, and we see the approaching day of God. The believer dies in faith and expectation of that day, in which death will introduce him to the judgment seat of Christ, and to the possession of eternal glory. *It is appointed unto men once to die and AFTER this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and to them that look for him shall he appear the second time with-*

out sin unto salvation *.—This is the scripture representation of the matter, and we never should have thought of an intervening state, or the possibility of a connexion with any objects whatsoever in the other world without a resurrection, had not *death* and *judgment*, which the scripture so closely unites, and brings near, been disjoined and set at an immense distance from each other, by the traditions and doctrines of men.

We are directed to prepare for the day of judgment, that we may be *found* of Christ in peace without spot, and blameless, that we may have boldness and not be ashamed before him at his coming. But with what propriety are these directions given, if we have reason to believe that we shall be found of him, receive his approbation, and enter into peace ages before the commencement of that period. If the states of men are unalterably fixed immediately upon the death of the body, the wicked punished with everlasting misery, and the righteous rewarded with eternal happiness, all the decisions of the great day will be effectually precluded and rendered nugatory, men having already received their doom.

What can the general judgment be for, if every man has been previously tried and his case decided upon? Will the justice of the preceding decisions be called in question? Or will it be an appeal from the former sentence? It is impossible. The idea of an appeal from the sentence of the supreme judge (whose decisions are all unchangeable, being founded in eternal justice, and unerring

* Heb. ix. 27, 28.

wisdom is ridiculous and absurd; why then should there be a second judgment? will the characters of men alter? will those who have received the divine approbation, and who have been introduced into that state of inconceivable felicity, which is prepared for the righteous; will they, I say, be capable of falling from that state of perfection and glory, and at last be covered with shame at the appearing of Christ? or will the wicked be capable of atoning for their guilt, of rendering themselves acceptable to the divine being, and so get their sentence of damnation reversed? Both these are impossible; the word of God has determined the present state to be the alone state of trial and probation.

What then will be the design of the general judgment? Will the objects of divine vengeance be dragged from that state of damnation, in which they already are, and undergo the formalities of a trial only to be told (what they had been told before, and well knew) that that state of misery and woe (in which they had been for ages, and from which they had no hope of deliverance) would endure for ever?

Will the heirs of glory after they have been so long in possession of the eternal inheritance, and that possession founded upon the unerring decision of the allwise God, the judge of all; shall they be again brought to trial? Shall their right to the inheritance be again litigated and put to the test, and the propriety of the divine conduct in adjudging them worthy of it, called in question? This surely can never be the nature and design of the general judgment; and yet if men are to receive

according to their works before that day, I am not able to see how these consequences can be avoided.

Such an account of the day of judgment, in my opinion, makes all its grandeur and important consequences dwindle into nothing. The solemnities of that day, the majesty of the judge who shall be revealed in flaming fire, the assembly of the world, the audience of angels, the opening of the books, with all the process of that day; what are they all for? No doubt for decisions of importance equal to the dignity and splendor of the proceedings. But if man receives his sentence, either of damnation or salvation, immediately upon the death of the body, the great work of this day will be to decide *nothing*, or, which is the same thing, to make that decision which had been infallibly and unalterably made and determined long before. But the doctrine of a two-fold judgment one immediately after death, and the other after the resurrection, is not the doctrine of scripture. That tells us of *a day*, and of but one day, in which God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ; at that day it is in which Paul, with all that love the appearing of Jesus Christ shall receive the crown of righteousness, from the Lord the righteous judge. And with an eye to that day, may it be our concern to be steadfast and unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, inasmuch as we know that our labour is not in vain in the Lord.

M A R M O S,

To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.

GENTLEMEN,

IN addition to the observations of *Philander* and *Subsidiarius*, and in reply to the last communication of *Eubulus*, I beg leave to make a few remarks on what he has advanced with respect to the manner in which christians in general spend the Sunday, or the Lord's day, making it a cessation from all worldly business.

This, *Eubulus* says, vol. v. p. 342, "is an institution which cannot be productive of any valuable ends, but such as are easily attained without it. It not only occasions a loss to individuals, and to the community at large, of one seventh part of the industry of the manufacturers and labourers of every kind; but, what is infinitely more important, induces a very large majority of that most useful and numerous part of the species, to mispend that seventh of their time in dissipation and intemperance; which too naturally, and too certainly, leads them to vicious immoralities, and crimes of every degree."

In support of this opinion, he says, p. 345. "The apostles and first disciples of Christ are nowhere said to have distinguished the first day of the week, in any manner whatsoever;" and again, vol. vi. p. 265. "The christians of the
"second

“second century did not derive, and consequently had not received, any such institution from the apostles of Christ, and their immediate disciples.”

Farther, speaking of the writers of the three first centuries, he says, p. 349. “Instead of informing us that such a sabbath was kept, they expressly assure us, that neither had the gospel enjoined, nor did they practice any such observance.—In the first and purest ages of christianity, their meetings were short, and either very early in the morning, before the usual hours of business, after which they departed, each to their several occupations, or else in the evening, after the business of the day was ended.”

As Eubulus seems to acknowledge that the practice of the second and third centuries, will enable us to ascertain what was the practice of the apostles, and agreeable to the will of Christ, I shall endeavour to satisfy him, that Sunday was spent by christians of that age, as far as circumstances would permit, in the same manner as it is generally spent now, viz. that it was considered as a *sacred day*, and that then christians passed as much time in places of public worship as they do now.

I need not quote particular passages, to prove what must be allowed by all, viz. that in every place in which christians were numerous, there was a place for their assembling themselves, distinct from a private house. This, is evident from Paul's epistles to the Corinthians, especially 1 Cor. ii. 22. Indeed it is natural to suppose, that christians would imitate the Jews in this respect. In these places of general assembly,

sembly, the epistles directed to whole churches were, no doubt, publicly read, as they continued to be in after times. In these places several services were regularly performed, and proper officers were appointed, and paid for the purpose. We read in the New Testament of *elders*, *deacons*, and *deaconesses*. This so exactly resembles the custom of a later period, that it affords a considerable presumption that those officers were employed in the same manner from the beginning, viz. some of them in the instruction of christians assembled for that purpose, and especially on the Lord's day.

That there were these assemblies of christians, and that they were held on the Lord's day, appears pretty clearly from the epistles of Ignatius; which, whether genuine or not, were no doubt written within the period mentioned by Eubulus.

Exhorting Christians to perfect unanimity, he says, "As therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to him, neither by himself, nor yet by his apostles, so neither do ye any thing without your bishop and presbyters. Neither endeavour to let any thing appear rational to yourselves apart; but being come together into the same place, have one common prayer, one common supplication, one mind, one hope, in charity undefiled.—Wherefore come ye all together as unto one temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ, who proceeded from one Father, and exists in one, and is returned to one*."

* Μὴδε πειρασθῆτε εὐλογεῖν τι φανεῖσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ μᾶ προσευχῇ μᾶ δεήσις, εἰς τὴν μᾶ ἐλπίς, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν τῇ χάριτι

Again, speaking of perfect christians, he says,
 “No longer observing sabbaths, but keeping the
 “Lord’s day, in which also our life is sprung up
 “in him, and through his death, &c.”*

To these places of general assembly, which were called *churches*, christians came sometimes from considerable distances, which must have taken up much time, as also must the business that was done when they were assembled. The most authentic account of this is found in Justin Martyr, and is as follows :

“On the day that is called Sunday, there is an
 “assembly of all who live in the cities, or in the
 “country; and the acts of the apostles, and the
 “writings of the prophets are read, according as
 “the time will permit. The president discourses,
 “instructing the people, and exhorting them to
 “good actions. Then we stand up to pray, and
 “after prayer, bread, and wine with water, are
 “brought, and the president offers prayers and
 “thanksgiving as he is able, and the people join
 “in saying amen. Then there is a distribution,

τη χάρα τη αμωμω. Εἰς εἶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὃ ἀμεινον ἔδεν εἶν.
 Παύλες ἐν ὡς εἰς ἐνα παον συνίρεχέε θεω, ὡς ἐπὶ το ἐν θυσιαστηριον, ὡς
 ἐπὶ ἐνα Ἰησοῦ χριστον, τον ἀφ ἐνος πατρος προελθοντα, καὶ εἰς ἐνα οἶκα
 καὶ χρηρησαβια. Ign. Ad. Mag. c. vii. p. 19.

† Εἰ ἐν ἐν παλαιοις πραγμαστον ἀνατραφεῖλες εἰς παννὸν
 ἐλπίδος πλῆθος; μετὰ ἐν σαββατισμοῖς ἀλλὰ πάλαι κυριαστον [ζωην]
 ζῶντες, ἐν ἡ καὶ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέλειπεν δι’ αὐτῆς, &c. Ign. Ad.
 Mag. c. ix. p. 20. The Greek has the word ζῶν, but as
 it is not in the Latin translation, and without it there is a
 better contrast to keeping the sabbath, mentioned immedi-
 ately before, it is, I believe, universally considered as an
 interpolation. See the note of Cotilerius on the passage.

“and

“ and a partaking of the things for which thanks
 “ were given, and they are sent to those who are
 “ absent by the deacons. The rich give accord-
 “ ing to their pleasure, and what is collected is
 “ deposited with the president for the relief of
 “ widows, and orphans, the sick, &c.”*

This is certainly very similar to the account that any person would now give of christians spending the Lord's day. Nothing is said of this business being transacted in the morning, or evening only; so that we cannot but conclude that it was done in mid-day; and it must have taken up a considerable part of it.

The Lord's day had not the appellation of *a sabbath*, nor was it *a fast*; but it was always called *a festival*; and both with the Heathens and the Jews, festival days were no more employed in labour than fast days, though on them they were at liberty to work if they pleased.

The writer of the epistle of Barnabas, comparing the jewish religion with the christian, says,
 “ The sabbaths which ye now keep are not ac-
 “ ceptable to me; but those which I have made,

* Τη τε ημερῃ λεγομένην ἡμέραν πάντων καὶ πόλεως ἡ ἀγρῶν μενούσων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἀποσημιονεῖσθαι τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγραμμάτια τῶν προφητῶν, ἀναγιγνωσκέσθαι μέχρις εὐχαρίῃ. Ἐπειτα, παύσαντων τε ἀναγιγνωσκόντων, ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νεύσειαν καὶ προκλήσιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τιλῶν μίμησεως ποιεῖται. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνίσταμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν· παύσαντων ἡ μὲν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται, καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ· καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων τὸ ἀμήν. Καὶ ἡ διαδοσις καὶ ἡ μέταληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἐκαστῷ γίνεσθαι, καὶ τοῖς κ' ἑαυτοὶ διὰ διακονῶν πέμπεται. Apol. 1mo. Edit. Thirlby, P. 97.

“ when

“when resting from all things I shall begin the eighth day, that is the beginning of the old world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead; and having manifested himself to his disciples, ascended into heaven*.”

Tertullian comparing the festivals of the Heathens with those of christians, says “If you would indulge to pleasure, you may; and not on one day, but on many. With the Heathens festival days return once a year, but to thee every eighth day is a festival †.”

Dionysius bishop of Corinth, in his letter to the church of Rome, quoted by Eusebius, says, “This day, being the Lord’s day, we keep it holy. In it we read your epistle, as also the first epistle of Clemens ‡.”

Clemens Alexandrinus says, that “a true christian, according to the commands of Christ, observes the Lord’s day, by casting out all evil thoughts, and entertaining all good ones, glorifying the resurrection of the Lord on

* Ορατε πως λεγει· ε τα νυν σαββατα εμοι δεδιασθα α πεποιηκα εν α καλαπαυσας τα παθη, αρχην ημερας υγδοης ποιησω· ο εστιν αλλε ποσως αρχην. Διο και αγομεν την ημεραν την υγδοην εις ευφροσυνην, εν η και ο Ιησους ανεστη εκ νεκρων, και φανερωθεις ανεβη εις τας υρανας. Barnabæ Epict. c. xvii.

† Si quid et carni indulgendum est, habet. Non tantum dies tantum, sed et plures. Nam ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est, tibi octavus quisque dies. De Idolatria, cap. xiv. p. 94.

‡ Την σημερον εν κυριακη αγιαν ημεραν διαγαγομεν, εν η αν-εστηκαμεν υμιν την επιστολην ην εξομεν, ατι πολλε ανανηυσκουσις ναδελεισθαι, ως και την προτεραν ημιν δια Κλεμεντος γραφισαν. Euseb. Hist. L. iv. c. xxiii. p. 187.

that

"that day *." The same writer even calls the the Lord's day, though not a sabbath, a *day of rest*, the *chief of days*, our *rest indeed*; intimating, at the same time, that the observance of the seventh day was intended to prepare the way for the observance of the eighth†.

We cannot collect with exactness how much time the primitive christians spent in public worship. But it should seem that it could not be less, but rather more, than we usually employ in it. According to the excellent author of the *Enquiry into the Constitution of the Primitive Church*, they usually preached an hour. The lessons were also of considerable length. That which was the subject of Origen's homily on Jeremiah, reached from chap. xv. ver. 10. to xvii. ver. 5. and another was from 1 Sam. xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii. part ii. p. 13.

"Their psalms," Bingham says (Summary of Christian Antiquities, vol. ii. p. 87) "were lengthened to an indefinite number, between every one of which they had liberty to meditate, and fall to their private prayers, which Stillingfleet thought had always a place in their service. They met," he says, *ibid.* p. 88.

* Οὕτως ἐβόλην τὴν κατὰ εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξαμένῃ, κυριακῇ ἡμέρῃ τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἀποβάλλῃ φαῦλον νοῦμα, καὶ γνωστὸν προσάγει, τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ τε Κυρίῳ ἀναστῶν δοξαζῶν. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 877. Potteri Ed.

† Ἡ ἑβδόμη τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναπαύσεως κηρυσσέσθαι, ἀποχή κακῶν, ἐτοιμαζούσα τὴν ἀρχιγονοῦν ἡμέραν, τὴν το οὕτως ἀναπαύσει κμῶν· ἣν δὲ καὶ πρῶτῃ τῷ οὐκ φαῖν· γενέσθαι, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνθεωρεῖται καὶ πάντα ἀληθεύονται. ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας ἡ πρῶτη σοφία καὶ ἡ γνῶσις ἡμῶν ἐλλαμπέται. Clem. Al. Strom. vi. p. 810. Ed. Pott.

"at

“at three o'clock, or our nine in the morning.” It is evident from Cyprian, that they had service both in the morning and the evening; in the morning in commemoration of the resurrection, and in the evening to partake of the Lord's supper*.

I have not quoted any later writers, as Eubulus would not allow them to be of sufficient authority; though when there is no trace of any difference in opinion or practice, among so many discordant sects as christians were soon divided into; it may be presumed that what we find to be the universal opinion, or practice, of a later period, was also that of a former one. I shall, therefore, only just mention what Austin says of the Lord's-day. “It is, therefore, he says †, called the “Lord's-day, because in it, abstaining from all “earthly labours, and the allurements of the “world, we employ it only in divine worship.” In the Apostolical Constitutions also directions are given to *assemble continually* on the Lord's-day. *συνερχεσθε ἀδιαλείπτως.* Lib. vii. cap. 30.

Besides the public worship of the Lord's-day, the *love feasts* of the primitive christians were also held on the same day, and generally in the evening; as may be inferred from the famous letter of Pliny, in which he says, “the christians meet on

* Nos autem resurrectionem domini mane celebramus. Christum offerre oportebat circa vesperam diei. Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. p. 156.

† Ideo dominicus appellatur, ut in eo a terrenis operibus vel mundi illecebris abstinentes, tantum divinis cultibus ferviamus. Aug. Civit Dei, l. xxii. c. xxx. Pearson on the Creed, p. 266.

“ a certain

“ a certain day to sing hymns to Christ, and lay themselves under a solemn obligation not to commit any wickedness, &c. then they depart, and meet again to partake of an entertainment very innocent, and common to all.” Tertullian speaks of this love feast as a *supper*, a little before night; and in the three first centuries, Bingham says it was held in the churches, vol. ii. p. 252. According to these accounts, the christians of the three first centuries must have spent a very great part of every Sunday in their churches.

What is here said relates to times of peace, in which christians were at liberty to spend their Sundays as they pleased. In seasons of persecution the public assemblies of Christians, would, no doubt, be much interrupted, discontinued, or be held by night. But there could be no occasion to do this in any place out of Judea till the reign of Nero, because christians were not persecuted by the Romans till that time. Consequently, their first customs would be fixed very early, in the age of the apostles; and they would be the same to which they would revert, when, after a season of persecution, peaceable times should return. The latter, therefore are an indication of the former.

All, therefore, that could be meant by the primitive christians when they said that they kept no *sabbaths*, must, if we judge by their practice, have been either that they did not observe the Jewish sabbath of the seventh day; or that, as on other festival days, they did not hold themselves absolutely obliged to refrain from labour

on Sundays; and in climates in which the weather was uncertain, they would probably work in the fields in time of harvest. Indeed, I see no good reason why we should scruple to do this; as work of this kind comes under the description of *work of necessity*, as much as the lifting up an ox or an ass that should fall into a pit on the sabbath day, which the most rigid of the Jews themselves allowed. In Judea the seasons and the changes of weather are regular; so that no inconvenience would arise from a constant resting every seventh day.

That Constantine intended an absolute cessation from all labour on the Sunday, is not probable, since his order respected Friday*, as much as Sunday; and two days in a week would certainly have been thought too much to abstain from labour. Besides, it is well known, that the christians respected the Jewish sabbath, though not in so high a degree as the Lord's day, and had assemblies in the churches on that day.

I would observe, however, that Eubulus is mistaken in asserting, p. 256, that "with the Jews not only all business and travelling, but all social and pleasurable intercourse with each other was prohibited; and each family was in a manner circumscribed within its own dwelling, except during the hours of attendance at the temple, or in the synagogue." No such

* Διο τοις ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν ποιουμένοις ἀπασὶ σχολῇ ἀγείν ταις ἐκωνυμοῖς τὴ σωτήρος ἡμεραις ἐνδέτεται ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν πρὸ τῆ σαββάτου τιμᾶν. For such it is acknowledged was the original reading, and not τὰς τῆ σαββάτου.

precept

precept as this is found in Moses, and the Jews in all ages, generally made choice of the sabbath in preference to all other days for their social entertainments. "On the sabbath," says Reland, "they put on their best cloaths, in honour of it, and use every expression of joy, especially in feasting, and indulging themselves as well as they can afford *."

I am the more surprized that Eubulus should imagine the Jews spent their sabbaths in this recluse and rigid manner, when it appears from Luke (ch. xiv. 1, &c.) that Jesus was invited to what may well be called a *feast*, at the house of one of the chief Pharisees, on the sabbath day. That the company on this occasion was large, is evident from their *chusing out the chief rooms*, and that it consisted chiefly of persons of distinction, is probable, from its giving our Lord occasion to advise his host, that, when he made a feast, he would not invite *his friends, and rich-neighbours, &c.* which seems to imply that he had then done so.

The christians of Tertullian's time were far from spending the Sunday in the rigid and gloomy manner in which it was observed by the old Puritans. "It is said," says he, "let your works shine, and now our shops, and gates shine. For you will find more doors

* Porro in ipso sabbatho requiritur indutio vestium pretiosorum, in honorem sabbathi, et summa læticia, cujus plurima signa edunt, epulando et indulgendo genio, quantum res unius cujusque patitur. *Antiquitates sacre*, Par. IV. cap. viii. sect. 10. p. 300.

"without lights and laurels among Heathens than among Christians*." And this book was written when he was a Montanist, the most rigid of all the sects of christians.

Hilary says, "We on the eighth day, which is also the first, rejoice in the festivity of a perfect sabbath†." It is evident, however, that the Sunday festivity of the primitive christians did not consist in sports, but in singing psalms, and other expressions of religious joy, or in cheerful society.

What were the practices of the Christians in the times of the apostles, may be pretty safely inferred from those of the times that immediately succeeded them, since we have no account of any difference between them. Besides, the apostles, and all the Jewish christians, having been used to a weekly day of public worship, and having, no doubt, experienced the benefit of it, would naturally continue the same custom when they became christians, and recommend the same to the Gentile converts. Indeed, it is most evident, and allowed by all, that the customs respecting the Jewish synagogues were kept up in christian churches, the former having been, in all respects, a model for the latter.

But independently of these strong *presump-*

* Sed luceant inquit opera vestra. At nunc luceant tabernæ et januæ nostræ. Plures jam invenies ethnicorum fores sine lucernis et laureis, quam Christianorum. De Idolatria, cap. xv. p. 94.

† Nos in octava die, quæ et ipsa prima est, perfecti sabbati festivitate lætamur. Prologus in Psalmorum explanationem. Opera, p. 637.

tions, from practices both prior and subsequent to those of the apostolic age, there appear to me to be sufficient marks of regular assemblies being held by christians in the books of the New Testament, and also of those assemblies being held on the first day of the week.

As this day was unquestionably in after times called *the Lord's day*, it may safely be concluded to be the same that was intended by the same term in the book of Revelation. For christians, who made so much use of the books of the New Testament, would never use words in senses different from those in which they apprehended them to be used there. This day, therefore, had, even in the age of the apostles, acquired a peculiar appellation, and was, in the customary forms of speech, distinguished from all the other days of the week; and the probability will be that, along with the same *name*, the early christians received from the apostles the *customs* peculiar to that day, and such as have been recited from their writings.

But there is not wanting, in my opinion, the clearest evidence in the books of the New Testament themselves, that all the christians in such large cities as Corinth and Ephesus assembled for public worship at mid-day, and that these assemblies were held on the Lord's day. This is more particularly evident from the epistles of Paul to the Corinthians, whose public assemblies required much regulation. In them he distinguishes the church; from private houses, as was mentioned before, 1 Cor. ii. 22. He speaks of the whole church coming together into one place, 1 Cor.

xiv. 23. 26. and again 1 Cor. xi. 18. In these churches, or public assemblies, women were to keep silence, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. and strangers were frequently present, so as often to be converted by what they heard or saw in them, v. 23. *If therefore the whole church be come together, into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad. But if all prophecy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is with you of a truth.* It appears also from the epistle of James that strangers frequently attended the public assemblies of christians, ch. ii. 2. *If there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man, in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that hath the gay clothing, and say unto him, sit thou here, in a good place; and say to the poor, stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool, &c.*

What do these circumstances give us an idea of, but of such promiscuous assemblies as are now held by christians in all countries, and in mid-day, to which any strangers that chuse it may resort? What were churches in private houses? (1 Cor. xvi. 9. Coll. iv. 15.) but assemblies of christians held there, independent of the proper members of such houses? And where were epistles to whole churches read, but in such assemblies? as in the church of Laodicea, Coll. iv. 16. That these assemblies were held frequently

quently and regularly, appears from several circumstances. Their being attended by strangers sufficiently implies it. For how could such persons know of private, or only occasional assemblies? In Acts ii. 25. we read of Paul and Barnabas *assembling themselves a whole year with the church, and teaching much people.* What could this be but attending regular assemblies of the whole church in that populous city, where the christians were numerous in a very early period?

If these assemblies were *weekly*, there can hardly be any doubt but that they were held on *the Lord's day*; and notwithstanding what has been urged by Eubulus on this head, I cannot help thinking it very evident, that this was the case both at Corinth, and at Troas.

With respect to the former, though the apostle speaks of the money to be collected (1 Cor. xvi. 2.) as laid up by individuals, on the first day of the week; I cannot help thinking with Mr. Locke, that, it was also on that day to be deposited in some one hand, or place; because otherwise it would not have answered his purpose, in preventing all gatherings when he should come. Could he mean to intimate that they should every week, and on the first day of the week in particular, put into a private purse in their own houses whatever they intended for this charity, lest it should get mixed with their other money, and afterwards they might not be able, or willing, to separate it? This, surely, was too trifling, and arguing an unworthy distrust of their liberality. Besides, is not the unquestionable fact of all similar collections of money in after times

being made in churches, and on the Lord's day, a sufficient evidence that the practice began in the times of the apostles. Indeed, why should the apostle mention *the first day of the week* on this occasion, if it was not the time of their public assemblies?

I have particularly considered all that Eubulus has advanced in support of his opinion, that Paul preached at Troas on the evening before the Lord's day, and not on the evening of that day, and think it evident that his conclusion is ill-founded. It appears from Acts xx. 6. that at this time Paul spent seven days in Troas. Why then should he preach to them on the first day of the week, if it had not been the time of their usual assemblies. He had his choice of all the seven days; but probably, the wind not being favourable for sailing, he did not chuse to call the church together before their usual time of meeting, and before that went from house to house.

Eubulus lays much stress on the Jews beginning the day on the evening. But, as Dr. Lardner says in his *Observations on Macknight's Harmony*, p. 9. (in which he shews that the women went to embalm the body of Jesus on the morning of the first day of the week, and not on the evening of the seventh, though that morning, just before sun rise, is said, Matt. xxviii. 1. to be *the end of the Sabbath*)
 "All know very well that the Jewish civil day
 "began at the setting of the sun; but that day
 "was divided into two parts, *night* and *day*; by
 "day meaning the natural day, or that part of
 "the civil day which is light."

To

To use the term *day* for *day light* was as customary with the Jews as it is with us. Thus, Luke says, ch. xxii. 6. *As soon as it was day, the elders of the people, &c. led Jesus into their council,* though, according to Eubulus, the Jewish day was then half expired; and all the preceding transactions (of the same day, according to him) are said to be done *on the evening*, and the *night*, as if they belonged to the preceding day; just as we should now speak. So also Ezra is said (Neh. viii. 3.) to have read in the book of the law *from the morning until mid-day*, though, according to Eubulus, their *mid-day* was passed about the time of his beginning to read. Also the term *next day* is used in opposition to the evening before, though, according to him, it was a part of the same day, Acts iv. 2. *They put him in hold to the next day, for it was now even-tide.* And yet Eubulus refers to this passage as in his favour, p. 268.

I have no doubt, therefore, but that when we read, Acts xx. 7. *And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them (ready to depart on the morrow) and continued his speech unto midnight,* the assembly began in day-light of the Sunday, and that the *next day* was the Monday following; especially as there was then no persecution of christians, to induce them to hold their assemblies in the dark. I shall conclude with a few observations of a more general nature, but I shall not enlarge upon them.

1. If the appropriation of one day in seven for the purpose of public worship was the practice of the apostles, we may conclude that it is not hurtful,

hurtful, but useful. And though we Gentile christians are not bound by the Jewish ritual, we may safely infer that if the sabbath, as observed by the Jews, necessarily led to evil, it would not have been appointed by God for them. And from its not being hurtful to *them*, we may safely infer that it cannot be so to *us*, since human nature is the same. That this observance was prevented from being hurtful to the Jews by any peculiar restrictions with respect to social intercourse, I have shewn to be a misapprehension of Eubulus.

2. In my opinion the cessation from labour on the Lord's day makes a pleasing and useful distinction in our time; and besides its excellent religious and moral uses, greatly contributes to the civilization of mankind. The expectation of it relieves the labour of all the preceding six days; and consequently that labour is done better with this interval than it would have been without it, to say nothing of the relief that it affords the labouring cattle.

3. Besides, I cannot help thinking that in this country the manufacturers labour to excess; and that it would be very desirable, would contribute to lengthen their lives, and make their lives much happier, if their labours could be moderated. The riches of this nation are procured by the premature exhausting of the strength and vital powers of the greater part of our manufacturers; though it is denied that the intemperance of many of them contributes to the same effect. Like our horses, their lives are shortened, and made wretched, by fatigue.

4. If the laws did not provide intervals of rest from

from labour, the labourers themselves would not fail to do it; and the intervals of their own providing would have a worse effect than the present. Our annual feasts, in every town and village in the kingdom, are far more mischievous than Sunday spent in the worst manner. For no ideas of religion being now annexed to them, licentiousness has no restraint.

5. If it were left to every individual to chuse his own time for public worship and instruction (if such a custom could be called *public*) many would greatly abridge, and many would neglect it altogether; as we see to be the case with family worship, even where the obligation and use of it are acknowledged. The consequence would be that secular concerns would engross their whole time, and the very appearance and profession of christianity would be in danger of disappearing among us. But on such topics as these I forbear to enlarge, as it has been done sufficiently by PHILANDER and SUBSIDIARIUS.

That much evil arises from the manner in which Sunday is now spent by many, both of the lower and higher ranks in the community, cannot be denied; but I hope it is not without a remedy, and I am fully persuaded that the abolition of the observance of Sunday would be attended with much greater evil.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your's, &c.

H E R M A S.

**To the DIRECTORS of the THEOLOGICAL
REPOSITORY.**

GENTLEMEN,

AS your publication is professedly open to any discussion that can throw light upon religion, I some years ago took the liberty to send you a query relating to the origin of the Arian hypothesis, particularly addressed to Mr. Taylor, the author of the *Letters of Ben Mordecai*; at the same time animadverting on the sarcastic manner in which it seemed to myself and others, that he treated the controversy between Dr. Horsley and Dr. Priestley. I concluded with saying, “If Mr. Taylor has any value for the opinion for which he has so largely contended, he will not chuse that the opposers of it should be able to say, uncontradicted, that notwithstanding the numerous writings of learned christians in the interval between the age of the apostles and that of Arius (in which their own opinions concerning the person of Christ are so largely discussed, and those of the unlearned christians so particularly mentioned, or alluded to) no trace should be found of its having any favourers at all. Had the genuine doctrine of the scriptures been so suddenly, and so long lost; and did it remain so absolutely unknown
“for

"for more than two hundred years?" vol. iv. p. 185.

Orders were given for the number of the Repository containing the above being sent to Mr. Taylor; but it appears from an *Address to the Public*, prefixed to a late posthumous work of his by his son, the Rev. Mr. Henry Taylor, that he never saw it, nor any more of the controversy between Dr. Horsley and Dr. Priestley than is contained in the *Monthly Review*, from which, it is acknowledged, he could form no idea of it at all. This, however, is of little moment; as is the manner in which Mr. H. Taylor is pleased to treat myself, as "destitute of candour," and having recourse to the "arts of controversy," &c. &c. and also his common place descending on the topic, of controversial writing in general, as "perverting the judgment, hardening, or corrupting the heart," &c. &c.—Whether I be the person described by Mr. Taylor, others will judge. To his censure I am perfectly indifferent.

What I write for is to observe that, hitherto no person has answered the *query* that I proposed. Mr. H. Taylor says, indeed, that the solution may be collected from *B. Mordecai's Letters* i, and viii. But I have repeatedly looked over those letters, without finding in them any hint for the solution. He there takes it for granted, as most others have done before him, that the genuine doctrine of the primitive ages, that which was derived from the apostles, may be collected from such writers as Justin Martyr, Tertullian,

tullian, Eusebius, &c. &c. all believers in the pre-existence of Christ.

All these writers, however, and all others now extant, before the time of Arius, held a doctrine very different from that of Mr. Taylor, viz. that the *logos* was nothing that had ever been created, but was an *attribute of the Father*; and also that besides this *logos*, Christ had a proper human soul, as well as a body. Whereas Dr. Priestley has shewn that there is abundant evidence, in these writers themselves, that the bulk of common unlearned christians believed nothing of the pre-existence of Christ in any sense; and that they were much shocked at the new notions of their learned teachers, which tended to make Christ more than a prophet, and to advance him to the rank of a *God*.

He has shewn that it was universally acknowledged by the orthodox writers, that neither the *pre-existence*, nor *the divinity* of Christ, was publicly taught by any apostle before John; the minds of men not being sufficiently prepared for it; so that they must necessarily have been what we now call *Socinians*, or *Unitarians*, as opposed both to *Arians* and *Athanasians*. The doctrine of pre-existence was, indeed, held by the Gnostics, by the Platonizing Fathers, and by the Arians, who were equally misled by the philosophy of the times; but not at all by the *common people*, who had no other teachers than the apostles, and the scriptures; and who saw no such doctrine in the scriptures. Also, the whole Jewish church was always free from such an unscriptural and improbable notion.

With

With respect to the *candour* with which the ancient Unitarians were treated by Justin Martyr, and others, Mr. H. Taylor says, p. 8, that "the Socinian doctrine being at first thought *meanly* of, sufficiently accounts for its not giving any alarm, and, in consequence, not being treated with that asperity and violence which many more formidable opinions met with."

But the Fathers themselves, who lived in that age, and therefore must have been better judges of the fact than Mr. Taylor, give a very different account of the matter. They say that the apostles did not teach the doctrine because it would have given too much offence. The Unitarians, therefore, according to these orthodox Fathers, were not *despised*, but *feared*, even by the apostles.

How Unitarians, if they had been considered as *heretics* at all, would have been treated in that early age, we may easily judge from the treatment they receive at present. For human nature, and religious zeal, are the same things. They are now the minority, and very lately were a small minority indeed. But did the Athanasians, or Arians, then treat them with the *candour* of Justin Martyr? Were they not always treated with the greatest *asperity* and *violence*? Such, no doubt, therefore would have been their treatment by the orthodox in the early ages, if they had been in the same circumstances.

No hypothesis can account for the fact of the great prevalence of unitarianism in the early ages so well as that of the orthodox of that age, though it is now universally acknowledged to be
a most

a most improbable one. For who can seriously believe that the apostles kept such important doctrines as those of the *pre-existence* and *divinity of Christ* a secret from the generality of christians, for fear of offending them, and that John alone, after the death of the other apostles ventured to teach it clearly?

As to the doctrine that Mr. Taylor contends for, viz. of Christ being the *visible Jehovah of the Old Testament*; it appears to me to be directly contradicted by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, who expressly says, that God spake to mankind by his son *in the last days* only. And if Christ be the Jehovah of the Old Testament, he must be *the one God*, besides whom there is no other. For this is uniformly asserted of Jehovah, whoever he be. We nowhere read of *two Jehovah's*, one visible, and the other invisible. This opinion, therefore, is undeserving of any discussion. And if Christ did not pre-exist in such a character as this, or in that of the creator of the world, he pre-existed, as far as we know, or can conceive, for no purpose whatever; and we may as well be supposed to have pre-existed ourselves.

I also wish that the Arians (all of whom believe the *immateriality of the soul*, with which has always been connected the idea of the *meanness of matter*, and the advantage of not being confined to a body) would attend more than they seem to have done to the condition in which they necessarily place Christ. Originally he is a glorious superangelic spirit, the creator of this world, if not of all worlds, his powers not circumscribed

scribed by the organs of any corporeal system whatever. But upon his incarnation, not only does he become a man, with all the infirmities of human nature, for the space of thirty years; but is for ever confined to a body. For as the Arians do not suppose that he will ever be divested of it, it must to him be an everlasting clog and punishment. Wherever he is, his body must be, and that it can be no advantage to him is evident from his pre-existent state. In short, he must be for ever reduced to the condition of the meanest of his followers in heaven; and, as far as appears, have no other society than that of creatures whom he made, and who will therefore, be always infinitely below himself. For a state that is glorious to *man*, must be a state of sad degradation to the *maker* of man. Much more then must this be a state of everlasting degradation to the eternal God, if Christ be the eternal God.

Let Arians also consider that great and important doctrines, such as those of the pre-existence of Christ, and his being the maker of the world, are not to be taken up on such light grounds as the supposition of their being merely *alluded* to in particular passages of scripture. When doctrines are clearly and explicitly taught, or when facts are well authenticated, we easily admit that there may be allusions to them, though they be obscure. But to build the doctrines themselves on such allusions, without one positive and express declaration on the subject, is building on the sand, or rather in the air. A foundation is wanting. There is nothing *certain* to allude to.

All writers and speakers naturally explain their allusions, when they imagine that they will not be easily understood. Since then Christ had not explicitly taught his disciples, or the Jews, the

doctrine of his pre-existence (a doctrine which nothing that they had been taught before could have prepared them to receive, and which therefore required the most explicit information) can we suppose that he would allude to it in such expressions, as, *Before Abraham was I am*, or, *What and if ye should see the son of man ascend up where he was before?* Whatever it was that he alluded to in the last expression, addressed to the twelve, he must have supposed it would be *understood* by them; and the writer must also have supposed it would be understood by his readers. But nothing had preceded to lead us to imagine that it was his *pre-existence* that he alluded to; because this doctrine had not been taught before.

At present the Arians, unable to make any reply to the argument from the state of opinions in primitive times, refuse to look that way, and content themselves with their arguments from the *scriptures*. But surely it ought to abate their confidence in such arguments, when they consider that the scriptures were not imagined either by the learned or the unlearned, to teach their doctrine in all the three first centuries, i. e. while there were advantages for understanding them that we have not now.

Contemptuously as the Athanasians and Arians have hitherto treated the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ, the time, I foresee, is not far distant, in which it will all recoil upon themselves. But whereas this contempt has not sunk the Unitarians, Athanasianism, and Arianism, will not be able to stand before it; those doctrines being as revolting to common sense, as they are to the scriptures, and being without a shadow of support from the history of the primitive times.

I am, Gentlemen, Yours, &c.

JOSEPHUS.

T O T H E

P U B L I C.

I Must once more, to the regret, I am persuaded, of many persons, discontinue the publication of this work; not for want of proper materials for carrying it on, but on account of the expence attending it; assuring my friends and the public, that it shall be resumed whenever the sale of these three volumes shall be such as to give me sufficient encouragement to do it.

To all lovers of theology and free inquiry, the greater part of the articles of which these three volumes consist, must, I am confident, appear original and truly valuable, even more so than those in the three first; and that some communication should always be open for pieces of this kind is certainly most desirable.

For the reasons given at the close of the first three volumes, I shall now also acquaint the public with my own signatures in these three. They are PAMPHILUS, HERMAS, PELAGIUS, BERYLLUS, BIBLICUS, JOSEPHUS, EBIONITA, PHOTINUS, and SCRUTATOR.

It may seem unfair to animadvert, as it will now be seen I have done, in this number, upon EUBULUS, when he will have no opportunity to

L 1 2

make

make a reply. But as it could not well be helped, I hope his candour will excuse it. If he should not chuse to wait the resumption of this work (which it is hoped may be in a year, or two, at the farthest) the press is still open to him; and it is my sincere wish, as I doubt not the goodness of his intentions, that he would take some opportunity of informing the public, in what manner he may have been impressed by the arguments in this Paper.

My impartiality in the conduct of this work, will not, I am confident, be impeached. If I have rejected any papers, it has never been because the opinions maintained in them were different from my own, but always on some other account, and chiefly because they were not sufficiently original; and I have rejected many more of those that were favourable to my opinions than of those that were against them.

It was my particular wish that *serious unbelievers* would propose their objections to christianity in this work. But neither during the publication of the three former volumes, nor of this last, have I been able to procure any, though for this purpose I have spared no solicitations, public or private; and no person could doubt my readiness to publish any thing of the kind, that should have been sent to me. This I think I may fairly attribute to there being few serious unbelievers, and to such an indifference to truth in the generality of them, as can never be deemed favourable to their cause.

This work would have been as open to Mr. GIBBON as to myself, and a public defence of what

what he has advanced, in some form or other, would certainly have been more consistent, and more manly, than meanly to undermine the foundations of christianity, while he absurdly affects to admire the superstructure. This also, if he have any confidence in his principles, or in his ability to defend them, would have become him better than to insinuate, as he has done (*Hist.* vol. v. p. 540.) the dangerous tendency of my writings, and point out passages in them at which he imagines *the priest, or the magistrate, may tremble*. The patrons of error and superstition have cause to tremble at every attempt to diffuse that light which may disperse their darkness, and expose the deeds of it, and it is evident they do tremble; but a *wise magistrate* will think himself a safe and unconcerned spectator in all theological discussions. At Mr. Gibbon's attack on christianity no christian need to tremble. It requires something more than words and polished phrases to give them any reason for this. Indeed, it requires something more than harmonious periods, to make even history instructive or interesting. He knows that his words have not inspired *me* with any terror. Let him reply to the animadversions on his writings in my *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, and my *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*.

Though I now think proper to suspend the publication of this work, the friends of free inquiry and truth will join me in wishing the speedy revival of it; and with this view, I shall continue to receive any communications that may be proper for it.

JOSEPH PRIESTLEY.

Birmingham, July 21, 1788.

A General Index to the Three last Volumes.

- ABRAHAM**, an Illustration of the Promise made to him. vol. iv. p. 261. v. 108.
- Agony, in the Garden**, explained. vi. 302. 347.
- Angels, fallen**, who meant by them, v. 166.
- Apostles**, Observations on their Inspiration. iv. 189.
- Apostolical decrees**, Observations on it. iv. 421.
- Arianism**, a Query relating to the Origin of it. iv. 71. Defended by Moderatus. iv. 153. Answer to him. v. 1. A large Account of the Nature and Origin of it. v. 306.
- **low**, a Query concerning the Date of it. vi. 276.
- Arians**, not Unitarians. iv. 339. v. 556. The contrary maintained, iv. 370.
- Article, Greek**, Observations concerning it. iv. 224. 374. 427.
- Albanusianism**, compared with Transubstantiation. v. 397.
- Ben Mordecai's Letters**, Animadversions on the Preface to the Second Edition of them. iv. 180.
- Census, in Luke**, Observations relating to it, v. 91.
- Christ**, Observation on his Inspiration, and impeccability. iv. 433, vi. 247. Replied to. vi. 209. Love to him according to the Scriptures, not easily reconciled to the Socinian Doctrine. vi. 99. Replied to. vi. 284. 382.
- Cock crowing, of Peter**, shewn to be the Sound of a Trumpet. vi. 105.
- David**, the future Glory of his House. v. 210. 301.
- Demoniacal Possessions**, Thoughts concerning them. iv. 128.
- Elijah, foretold by Malachi**, Who he is. vi. 135.
- Gog and Magog**, a Query concerning them. vi. 203.
- Heaven**, when the Kingdom of it will come. vi. 245.
- Indostan**, Queries relating to the Religion of it, with the Answers. vi. 409.
- Intermediate State**, not the Doctrine of the Scriptures. vi. 425.
- Inspiration**, Observations on it. iv. 17. iv. 364.
- Isaac**, Observations on his intended Sacrifice. vi. 60.
- Jaiab**, a new Translation with Notes on ch. i. ii. vol. v. 319. Observations on ch. vii. 10—23. viii. 5—19. v. 38. on ch. ix. 1, 2, as quoted by Matt. v. 123.
- John** xiv. 1, 2. Remarks on an Attempt to illustrate them in the Commentaries and Essays. v. 355.
- John** v. 7. shewn to be an Interpolation. v. 194.
- Jewish Ritual**, the Perpetuity of it. v. 403. vi. 1.
- Judaism**, whether the Credibility of it will follow from that of Christianity, v. 289. Replied to 366. vi. 39. 49.
- Lord's*

- Lord's Day*, the Observance of it objected to. v. 343. vi. 252. Defended. v. 22. vi. 113. 331.
- Malta*, on what Island of that Name Paul was Shipwrecked, iv. 39.
- Mark's Gospel*, an Explanation of some Passages in it. iv. 227.
- Matthew*, Observation on the Introduction to his Gospel, iv. 484.
- Messiah*, of the Jews, his supposed Pre-existence, iv. 477
— Observations on the Prophecies relating to him. v. 210. 301.
- Michael*, of *Daniel*, who he is to be. vi. 216.
- Miraculous conception of Jesus*, Observations unfavourable to the credibility of it. iv. 245. 484. v. 100. 129. Defended v. 83. Miscellaneous Remarks concerning it. v. 148.
- Moses*, Observations on his Inspiration. iv. 27. 123.
- Nicodemus*, Christ's Discourse with him, illustrated. vi. 272. 419. 420.
- Observations Miscellaneous*, on different Parts of this Work, by Nepiodidasalos. v. 185. By Anglo-Scotus. vi. 175.
- Ordination*, among Dissenters objected to, vi. 322.
- Palmer*, the Rev. *John*, some Account of him. vi. 217.
- Philo*, his Platonism. iv. 408.
- Plato*, his Principles. iv. 77.
- Platonists*, the later, their Principles. iv. 381.
- Price*, Dr. Remarks on his Sermons with respect to the Person of Christ. vi. 225.
- Prophecies in the Old Testament*, applied in the New. v. 111.
- Prophets*, Observations on their Inspiration. iv. 97.
- Psalms* 100, translated with Notes. v. 192.
- Repetitions*, vain, illustrated. vi. 178.
- Resurrection*, Queries relating to the Time of it. iv. 352.
- Taylor*, Dr. *John*, Remarks on his Key to the Apostolical Writings. iv. 57.
- Texts of Scripture*, more largely illustrated. Exod. xxiii. 13. iv. 73. 125. 15. ix. 6. vi. 345. Matt. xxiv. vol. vi. 186. John i. 1. v. 293. 385. vi. 58. John iii. 1—11. vi. 194. 372. John iv. 7, &c. vi. 419. John viii. 32, &c. vi. 415. John viii. 58. iv. 348. John xvi. 26, 27. iv. 345. Rom. i. iv. 211. 1 Cor. xv. vi. 79. Heb. ii. 16. v. 161. Heb. ix. 16, 17. iv. 139. Many illustrated by Nepiodidasalos. iv. 227. by a Friend of Philalethes. iv. 234. by Ereunetes. v. 273.
- Translation of the Scriptures*, a Proposal concerning it. iv. 187. Rules concerning it. 5. 200.

E R R A T A.

| | Page | Line | |
|----------|------|------|---|
| Vol. IV. | 29 | 26 | for literary, <i>read</i> literally. |
| | 115 | 20 | for John ii. 49, <i>r.</i> John xi. 49. |
| | 129 | 14 | for John i. 47. 49. <i>r.</i> John i. 47. 50. |
| | 130 | 14 | for Matt. xxiv. 63. <i>r.</i> Matt. xxvi. 63. |
| | 186 | 22 | for says— <i>r.</i> say. |
| | 259 | 4 | for himself, <i>r.</i> themselves. |
| | 285 | 31 | dele <i>have</i> before <i>heard</i> . |
| | 357 | 20 | for Jentry— <i>r.</i> Jewry. |
| | 370 | 1 | between <i>distinguish</i> and <i>from</i> insert <i>it</i> . |
| | 378 | 4 | for <i>αυασις</i> , <i>r.</i> <i>αυασις</i> . |
| | 392 | 22 | for for the, <i>r.</i> forth the |
| | 431 | 25 | for asserto, <i>r.</i> aperto. |
| | 497 | | lastline, <i>r.</i> of <i>those</i> . |
| Vol. V. | 6 | 11 | ——— <i>r.</i> supposition |
| | 17 | 28 | for Plotinus, <i>r.</i> Photinus. |
| | 31 | 27 | for Eyo, <i>r.</i> Eyo. |
| | 36 | 19 | for Plotinus, <i>r.</i> Photinus. |
| | 94 | 1 | dele <i>if</i> . |
| | 113 | 27 | for into, <i>r.</i> in, or into <i>it</i> . |
| | 173 | 23 | ——— <i>r.</i> 2 Pet. ii. 4. |
| | | 24 | for σοφς, <i>r.</i> σοφς |
| | | 25 | for τρημενς, <i>r.</i> τρημενς. |
| | 183 | 29 | for god, <i>r.</i> jod. |
| | 323 | 30 | for lived, <i>r.</i> livid. |
| | 380 | 14 | for If we cannot, <i>r.</i> If we can. |
| | 409 | 7 | for whether, <i>r.</i> whither. |
| | 437 | 18 | dele <i>wish</i> before <i>what</i> . |
| | | 29 | for he, <i>r.</i> be. |
| Vol. VI. | 26 | 10 | for as to scourge, <i>r.</i> that he scourged. |
| | 34 | 20 | for in, <i>r.</i> on. |
| | 35 | 32 | ——— <i>r.</i> spend. |
| | 155 | 31 | ——— <i>r.</i> <i>εκειναις</i> . |
| | 168 | 7 | for unto, <i>r.</i> you. |
| | 174 | 21 | ——— <i>r.</i> Christophilos. |
| | 192 | 14 | dele <i>and</i> . |
| | 193 | 7 | for <i>απαλιν</i> , <i>r.</i> <i>απαλιν</i> . |
| | 307 | 26 | for scence, <i>r.</i> scene. |
| | 328 | 20 | dele <i>the</i> before <i>apostles</i> . |
| | 341 | 22 | for suggests and justifies, <i>r.</i> suggest and justify. |

Instead of 249 A a, it is p. 349; &c. to p. 381.



